The covenant and its ritual boundaries in Palestinian Judaism and Pauline Christianity

Christiansen, Ellen Juhl

Abstract.

The present study is an analysis of covenantal identity and ritual boundaries based on texts ranging from the Old Testament, the Book of Jubilees, the Dead Sea Scrolls to the New Testament. A pattern of interdependence between group identity and boundary marks is traced, and the following thesis is examined: a community's identity is reflected in boundary marks, and ritual boundaries reflect a corporate identity. By using this general principle to interpret biblical and intertestamental material a pattern emerges: when identity is defined in ethnic categories, boundaries are wide, national boundaries, when identity is defined in particularistic categories, such as priestly purity, boundaries are narrow markers of purity. When identity is changed, boundaries change. Having chosen the Old Testament covenant concept as a term for ecclesiological identity the writer demonstrates that covenantal identity changes in Palestinian Judaism not least because it narrows down and builds on the principle of law. As a result of this, ritual boundaries become narrow marks of law observance. When such an interpretation is challenged by Paul covenant is redefined. The Old Testament and intertestamental pattern of interdependence helps to explain that Paul reinterprets covenant and why old ritual boundaries are replaced. Since for Paul identity is grounded in faith in the one Christ, the ecclesiological boundary is no longer an exclusive covenant rite, such as circumcision, rather baptism is, since it serves as a rite of identification with Christ and a mark of possession of the Spirit. This reflects a radical change in ecclesiology. When Christian baptism is the boundary marker that reflects unity with Christ and serves as an inclusive rite; it simultaneously becomes the only symbol for incorporation in the one church.

ELLEN JUHL CHRISTIANSEN

THE COVENANT AND ITS RITUAL BOUNDARIES

IN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM AND PAULINE CHRISTIANITY.

A STUDY OF ECCLESIOLOGICAL IDENTITY AND ITS MARKERS.

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
(Ph.D.)

University of Durham.

Department of Theology

Submitted in December 1993

Declaration.

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other University.

CONTENTS.

Preface.

This study would never have materialized if it were not for the fact that at an early stage in my research I met Professor James D.G. Dunn, D.D., Durham, that he saw the potentiality of the project and encouraged me to continue and start writing. When he accepted the role as my supervisor this gave me sufficient self-confidence to overcome difficulties as these arose. I am more than grateful for his continuous support. I have valued his criticism, his sharpness in the discussions of early drafts. I am perhaps most grateful for the freedom he gave me to disagree with him. I realise that without his support I would not have been able to "write myself to clarity". I consider the time spent with him as an important learning process. I appreciate what he has taught me and wish with this to express my warmest thanks.

For the last few years I have been commuting between Durham and my home in Aarhus, and have had the benefit of being able to use the libraries in both places. I did not always have access to my own books, nor was I able to use the same edition, a circumstance that accounts for the inconsistency, obvious in the use I make of for instance dictionaries. Thus, when I sometimes use the German *ThWNT*, sometimes the English *TDNT*, it is because it was the only practical solution to one of the minor problems in an all together impractical arrangement. It illustrates why I wish to express my thanks for the assistance to the staffs of both Durham University Library, Statsbiblioteket, Aarhus, and the Theological Faculty Library in Aarhus.

Several people have given their advice as the project developed, and I wish to thank especially lektor Sigfred Pedersen, professor, dr. theol. Benedikt Otzen, lektor Johannes Nissen, lektor Kirsten Laursen, and lektor dr. theol. Anna Marie Aagaard, University of Aarhus for their suggestions and engaging

in discussion and for their support. I further wish to express my gratitude to Canon David Jones, Tetbury, who has been most helpful, both when vice-principal at the College of St. Hild and St. Bede in Durham and later. Finally, I want to thank Dr. Ezra Kok for hospitality and discussions when we were both students in Durham.

Writing in a foreign language is far from easy, and I wish to acknowledge the assistance and help I have received from lektor Knud B. Bendtsen, Risskov and Rev T.A. Harman, Durham, for correcting parts of my thesis. My warmest thanks also to Dr. Nicholas Taylor, Durham, for suggesting improvements to my Danish-English style. Finally due thanks to Birgit Svenningsen who at an early stage typed a major part of the thesis. Stud. theol. Karen Nedergaard, Aarhus and Robert Hammond, Nottingham undertook to proof-read for me, and I wish hereby to express my gratitude. In spite of this assistance, the full responsibility for the formulations in this thesis rests with the author.

I wish hereby to take the opportunity to express also my thanks for the financial support I have received, from both Jens Vares Legat, Aalborg, Forskerakademiet, the University of Aarhus (Forskningsfonden) and the Danish Research Council (Forskningsrådet).

Risskov, December 1993.
Ellen Juhl Christiansen.

INTRODUCTION.*

This study has been undertaken in the light of the renewed interest in recent years in understanding identity. Since this is a large area, I shall narrow the focus to covenantal identity and its ritual boundaries.[1] When identity is collective identity, it answers the questions, "Where do we come from?" and, "Where are we going to?" with reference to a common tradition, to a shared communal style of life and to achieving a future goal. This means that covenantal identity has not only a temporal, historical dimension, a theological dimension of having a relationship with God, but also a social dimension. The same is the case when identity finds its expression in rituals which are shaped by a past, practised in the present, and goal-orientated. Identity expressed through rituals is essentially dynamic, not static.

While covenant has received a great deal of attention in recent scholarship, the problem is that it has been primarily defined in soteriological terms.[2] There has been less focus on covenant defined as an ecclesiological category. It is, however, theologically illegitimate to give priority to soteriology over ecclesiology. When I use the expressions "ecclesiology", or "ecclesiological", I do so in the broad and general sense of a "community", or "church" where members see themselves as having both a horizontal relationship to each other and a vertical relationship as a group with God, and not just in the narrow sense of a Christian church.[3] By applying these

---

* *For full bibliographical details I refer to my bibliography.*
The footnotes give only abbreviated forms.
Quotations from the Bible are from NRSV, unless otherwise stated.

[1] Discussion since the publication of E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 1977, confirms this renewed interest in relation to Palestinian Judaism. As far as Jewish identity in the Diaspora is concerned see, John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 1986.
The ongoing dialogue between Jews and Christians likewise shows a concern for identity and co-existence, cf. Marcus Braybrooke, *Time to Meet*, 1990.

[2] This is the way E.P. Sanders, Ibid., uses his "covenantal nomism". Thus, in a summary on p.422: "The "pattern" or "structure" of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God's promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God's mercy belong to the group which will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God's mercy rather than human achievement." Cf. also p.75.

[3] When I use "church" I have many, varied, complementary rather than exclusive, nuances in mind. I see "church" as a useful term since it contains the idea of both institution and community, of being called into existence locally, yet with a universal dimension, of being a community

terms to both Christian and Jewish contexts, I hope to emphasise a sameness of value and a diversity of forms. And while the neglect of the ecclesiological dimension is one of my starting points, it is also important to acknowledge that an ecclesiological model has, like any single model, its limitations.[4]

"Covenant"[5] is chosen because it is the most important metaphor of common identity and a shared relationship with God. It pervades, as we shall see, the Old Testament,[6] intertestamental Judaism and New Testament Christianity. Since it may be applied both to the people as a whole and to elect groups within it, it can serve well as an ecclesiological term in both a wide (ethnic) and a narrowly defined context of group identity.

As my title and subtitle indicate, I shall attempt two things. First, to define identity by focusing on covenant as an expression for a collective belonging. In order to provide a corrective to the one-sided soteriological interpretation it is necessary to reconsider the Jewish covenant from the point of view of it being a term for collective belonging.[7]

Second, by identifying those rituals that in a particular way are related to identity in Palestinian Judaism, in as much as they express affirmation of and/or entry into the covenant, I wish to give a rationale to the emergence of the Christian baptismal rite.[8] This aspect of baptism has been neglected by scholars, with the exception of Krister Stendahl.[9] This neglect seems to

---

gathered for worship, and of being a group commissioned to preach the Kingdom of God.
I wish to make a distinction between a community gathered as a congregation and a community which is united in a common faith, which in German is termed "Gemeinde" as opposed to "Gemeinschaft".

[4] For an excellent study of ecclesiology see, Avery Dulles, *Models*, 1988. Here he suggests five models for church, (1) institution, (2) mystical communion, (3) sacrament, (4) herald and (5) servant, and discusses the strength and weaknesses of each. Note, that covenant is in the context of "people of God", not a model in its own right.

[5] English "covenant" draws on both the Hebrew ברית and the Greek διαθήκη.

[6] Whenever I use "Old Testament" I do not place a value judgment on this term, but I use it simply because it is part of my Christian tradition. It will be evident for readers that I see "old" as a positive category, and question whether "new" stands for "better".

[7] I challenge E.P. Sanders who seems to mix the soteriological and ecclesiological categories when he operates with "staying in" and with behaviour that secures belonging. Cf. Ibid., 1977, p.17.

[8] For a review of literature on baptism, see Chapter Seven, I.

[9] Cf. *Oecumenica*, 1970, p.49: "The meaning of baptism cannot be found by exploiting any one specific interpretation of this rite, be it the element of free gift, or the relation to death-resurrection, or any of the other motifs which condition and enrich, but *never overshadow the rite of initia-*

be related to the concern to understand baptism in terms of salvation.

Alternatively expressed, I shall not make any attempt at explaining the origin of the Christian church and its baptism, nor trace the development from one rite to another. Rather, I shall question whether or not a differentiation between a Jewish and a Christian self-understanding is present already in the first generation, as represented by Pauline Christianity. By questioning the commonly held view, that just as circumcision was the entry rite to the old covenant, so baptism became the rite by which a believer enters the new covenant,[10] I shall attempt a different answer and look at this from the point of view of a "pattern of interdependence" between identity and rituals. Since scholars have not been sufficiently aware of the fact that when changes in entry rites occur this reflects in reality a changed identity, there is a need for another look at what at first sight may seem a well researched area.[11] Thus, my task is to answer the question why baptism became a rite of incorporation into the Christian church, by making a comprehensive study of the relation between covenantal identity and its rituals.

Thus, by letting the Jewish background shed light on Paul's presuppositions, by tracing "a pattern of interdependence" between covenant identity and ritual boundaries I shall consider the following fundamental questions: How is belonging to a Christian community different from belonging to a Jewish community? Does the change in ritual, from circumcision to baptism, reflect a radical change in identity? Is there a shift in what constitutes a covenant that is background to Paul which explains that he accepts a God-established covenant as opposed to a human covanant renewal? Is there a clear consciousness that a Christian covenant identity is different from a Jewish covenant identity? Is there an awareness that baptism functions as a

---

tion."(Italics mine.)
Since this is only a brief article it does not do justice to the problems involved.

[10] Thus Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.56-69, explicitly where he sets out in chapter four, p.56, to show that "the doctrine and practice of circumcision,... are presuppositions for the whole complicated question of New Testament baptismal doctrine and its consequent practice." Further, p.57, he points to a correspondence between baptism and circumcision for Jews which is "reception into the Old Covenant, just as Christian Baptism is reception into the New."

[11] Although Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches*, 1988, p.61, sees it as her task to consider "the function of ritual forms in the articulation and preservation of the sect's identity", she does not address the specific issue of baptism as a ritual of entry to the covenant, rather understands baptism as a ritual for the individual, hence interprets its function to be entry to sacred place, as initiation into the Pauline sect. The whole Jewish background is neglected.

covenant ritual or does it reflect identity of a different sort?

I. Why Covenant?

To focus on covenant is in continuity with a long tradition. While the covenant metaphor was coined originally in the Old Testament, it is a form of Jewish self-designation, in past and present. Consequently, no serious work on covenant can fail to take this *ad notam* when using covenant as an ecclesiological model of relationship with God.

As for a history of research on covenant in the Old Testament, this has often been reviewed and is readily available. A brief summary will suffice. Initiated by J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels,* 1883 and based on a literary criticism, the first tendency was to prove that "covenant" was a late, that is a Deuteronomic, concept, and a theologically loaded idea. This was opposed in the 1920's by S. Mowinckel and H. Gunkel's form critical studies. The general opinion was that "covenant" was an ancient idea going back to a tribal society. This was further supported by George E. Mendenhall, who studied the covenant as treaty outside the Old Testament, particularly in relation to the Hittites (2. millennium).[12] Following this, countless studies appeared to support this, among which the most prominent is Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament,* 1961, 1967.[13] With Lothar Perlitt, *Bundestheologie,* 1969, scholarship returned to Wellhausen's idea of covenant as a late idea. The same position is taken by Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and his People,* 1986. This monograph is particularly illuminating on covenant as theological idea.[14] Although he treats the covenant as a central idea in the Old Testament in relation to social identity, he does not deal with covenant reflected in rituals.

Of the considerable number of works on the intertestamental literature, a classic study, still worth consulting for its comprehensiveness, is Annie Jaubert, *La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abord de l'ère chrétienne,* 1963. While there has been much interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls from the perspective of their origin in the so called "Qumran community", their Essene character, reflecting a particular eschatology, soteriology, or view of the law, there has been less focus on covenant as an ecclesiological

---

[12] Cf. *BA* 17, 1954 and *IDB* I, 1962.

[13] G. Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament,* 1950, supports this view.

[14] Cf. p.52-82. Thus he concludes, "The attempt to relate the Old Testament covenant to suzerainty treaties may be said to represent a dead-end in the social/functional approach" (p.81). However, when he suggests that treating covenant as "institution" should give way to covenant as a "theological idea", this seems a false alternative which primarily hinges on dating the covenant idea to the later part of the monarchy (cf. Hos 6,7; 8,1).

category.[15] Although Göran Forkman, in *The Limits of the Religious Community,* 1972, deals with the issue of expulsion, and looks at ritual purity in that context, he relates the issue to holiness rather than covenantal identity. Michael Newton, in *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul,* 1985, examines purity in a context of righteousness, and he sees this to be related to identity, but without looking at the aspect of rites being entry to the covenant. The correspondence between purity rites as entry rites and a group's self-understanding calls for attention.

As for New Testament studies the tendency has been to concentrate on "the new covenant". This is the case in Erich Gräßer, *Der alte Bund im Neuen,* 1985, a substantial exegetical study of *diatheke* in the New Testament. The same tendency to focus on new is found in Susanne Lehne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews,* 1990, in which she gives an analysis of the contrast between the new covenant and the old cultic covenant. However they both neglect the ecclesiological aspect by emphasising covenant in its soteriological sense, thereby overlooking a connection between covenant and rituals affirming it.

If covenantal identity is seen against the background of other expressions of a collective self-understanding in the Old Testament, there are several important terms that also reflect covenantal belonging. Since they play a role in both intertestamental literature and the New Testament, I shall briefly mention them as possible alternative or replacement categories. Thus, עם, "people" (of God) is an inclusive term, used of Israel as a totality with the underlying assumption that belonging to the people of Israel is through birth.[16] Its limit is determined by geographical boundaries. Another term is בחיר, "elect", which when used of Israel as a people, identifies it in its special relation to God; it is exclusive of the non-elect.[17] Thirdly, קהל, (translated in LXX as: ἐκκλησία or συναγωγή), "assembly", is most significantly used of the people gathered to hear the reading of the law, or of a worshipping community; it limits belonging to

---

[15] For literature see below in Chapters Three and Four.

[16] Important is Exod 19,4-7; Deut 4; 7; 14; 26; 32.

[17] Election is most often expressed through the verb, בחר, which has God as the subject for the act. The concept is used in particular in the Deuteronomist writings, e.g. Deut 7,6; 14,1-2; 32,8-9, where election is grounded in the love of God.
On the one hand, the election of Israel has a universal scope, formulated for instance in Isaiah, 43,21; 45,1-4; 61,5-6, where election is for the purpose of being a light for the Gentiles.
On the other hand, a belief in one's own election can lead to an exclusiveness. All outsiders are seen as a threat. This is the case where the promise of land is interpreted as a right to conquest and to holy war, including destruction of the conquered people, cf. Deut 20,1-18; Jos 6,22-25; 7; 10,40-42; 11,16-20; 1 Sam 15.

those who can participate in the worship, typically determined by purity rules.[18] Intertestamental writings subsequent to the Old Testament seem to use קהל in a narrower sense with a political and/or religious content.[19] This tendency is even more obvious in the two terms, עדה, "congregation",[20] and יחד, "community".[21] When these two occur in the Dead Sea Scrolls they refer not to all Israel, but to an exclusive voluntarist group within Israel.

A brief definition of ברית, will suffice to explain why I use this as a category for identity. The Hebrew ברית designates a formal relationship among humans who are not related by kin, and between God and God's people.[22] Essentially, ברית stands for an agreement that is made between two or more parties, either between equals or imposed by a superior on an inferior party. Such an agreement has both secular and religious overtones, as found also in the English "covenant".[23] In secular contexts covenant functions as a

---

[18] Cf. Neh 8,2.17; 13,2. Further, Deut 5,22; 9,10; 10,4. Frequent in Chronicles. The aspect of gathering for worship is found in Ps 22,22.25.

[19] See e.g. Jos Ant 5,93 for the political- religious connotation of *qahal*/ekklesia.

[20] עדה, "congregation", can be used of various group gatherings, such as, of angels Ps 82,1; but when used of Israel, for instance in Exod 16,1; 17,1 or frequently in Numbers, it is used of the cultic congregation in the Tabernacle. In the Old Testament the term is parallel to קהל. LXX usually renders עדה by *συναγωγή*, and in CD עדה is the self-designation of the community of the "new covenant".

[21] The noun יחד is not frequent in the Old Testament, being found only in Deut 33,5 and 1 Chron 12,18, possibly with a political connotation. However, יחד is a self-designation with ecclesiological overtones in 1QS, e.g. 1QS 3,2. See below in Chapter Four.

[22] Most often ברית is in the Old Testament constructed with כרת, to "make (lit. to cut) a covenant". Intertestamental literature prefers other phrases. This shift in terminology may reflect the fact that the idiom, ברית כרת was reserved for a divine establishment, while other phrases for covenant establishment such as a) עבר, "enter" and b) בוא, used of human affirmation, are in a context of a liturgical formula. Other terms are c) שׂים, d) נתן, e) ערך, f) קום in *hi.* הקים, *pi.* קים, all variants of "establish" or "make"; קים most often "fulfil", and a unique occurrence (Deut 29,11 MT).
The most common prepositions are (a) ל, (b) את given by a superior, and (c) עם of equal partners, cf. M. Weinfeld, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.787-8.
The etymological explanations are less relevant from the point of how covenant functions, but see Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and His People,* 1986, p.94-99; M. Weinfeld, *EJ,* 5, 1971, col.1012-13; *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.7831-84; Ernst Kutsch, *THAT* I, 1971, p.340-41; James Barr, in *Beiträge,* 1977, p.23-38, is helpful for a semantic analysis.
Ernst Kutsch stands out since for him ברית has the sense (a) of God's self-obligation, and (b) of an obligation that God imposes on others, hence used of both act and content. Theologically the presence of God is a twofold presence experienced both as promise, grace and as law. Cf. *Verheissung,* 1973, p.71-75; 146-52.

[23] The expression "secular covenants" is used by G.E. Mendenhall, *IDB* I, 1962, p.716-17, of those covenants in which Yahweh is not involved directly. Secular covenants are of four types related to (a) suzerainty, (b) parity,

social[24] contract by binding a community internally, marking external frontiers, or uniting by treaty two or more groups politically on matters of common interest.[25] The covenant concept in its social and political sense was familiar in the cultures surrounding ancient Israel, but within the Old Testament ברית has primarily religious connotations.[26]

When the Old Testament authors formulate the relationship between the people and its God using ברית, this is a unique phenomenon in the history of religions.[27] What is unique is the ability to combine the two political authorities, the legislative and executive power, with the cultic and to hold these together within the idea of formalised God-given agreements with the people or representatives of the people. Whether or not the secular treaties for peace and loyalty are models for or have influenced the religious use of ברית in the Old Testament is difficult to ascertain, but an influence in one way or another cannot be excluded. Because humans relate to God both in a vertical and a horizontal relationship, a ברית with God is never a purely religious, vertical relationship, but it always has a social dimension. What is important is the idea that the horizontal relationship arises, on the one hand from sharing past events and stories about them, and on the other from common rituals and a common law. Arising from this observation, I believe it is significant that in the Old Testament ברית is never used in the plural. That this limits its function is obvious,[28] raising the

---

(c) a superior patron and (d) promissory oaths.

[24] What a social agreement is, can be illustrated from the covenant of friendship between David and Jonathan (1 Sam 18,1-4; 20,8; 23,18). Because Jonathan's loyalty to David leads to Jonathan being rejected by his father, Saul (20,30), the story combines the social and political elements of the covenant, and the covenant thus has a wider function than that of personal, individual friendship.

[25] There are several examples in the Old Testament of the use of covenant in a political, secular sense which can be illustrated from (a) Gen 21,22-32, cf. Gen 26,26-33; (b) Gen 31,45-54; (c) Joshua 9; (d) 1 Sam 11,1-4 and (e) 1 Kings 5,1-12, MT 5,15-26. In all these texts ברית is used with the verb כרת. George E. Mendenhall was the first to suggest an Old Testament covenant formula parallel to Hittite treaties.

[26] See below in Chapter One.

[27] See G. Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament*, 1950, p.55; and Benedikt Otzen, *Israeliterne*, 1982, p.111.
The statement of Walter Brueggemann in *The Bible*, 1983, p.307-33, that the covenant is a "political *novum* in history and a radical break with urban culture" (in reference to the premonarchial period (1250-1000 BC)) seems to be an overstatement.
For the view that Israel's covenant is not a unique phenomenon in the ancient world, see P.A. Riemann, *IDB*, Suppl. Vol, 1976, p.192.

[28] As noted by James Barr, *Beiträge*, 1977, p.30-31. He explains this oddity, p.31, not as an inability to think in plural terms, rather as a "restriction in the range within which the term *berit* was used."

question whether ברית is restricted to the singular because it has a divine origin. Is the theology of covenant as a horizontal relationship related to a belief in God as one?

II. Covenant and Covenants.

The Septuagint chose the translation διαθήκη for ברית rather than the more obvious συνθήκη, meaning "agreement" or "treaty", but also "covenant" in its sense of a bilateral agreement. Since a translation from one language to another always involves an interpretation on must ask not only why the translators used διαθήκη? but also what was the significance of this choice? It is conspicuous that of the 287 occurrences of ברית, διαθήκη is used in 260 cases showing that the choice of word is consistent rather than random. If the LXX plays on the classical Greek sense of "testament",[29] the issue is one of nuances of διαθήκη. The reasons for the choice of διαθήκη are not obvious,[30] as the disagreement between scholars shows.[31] If one has in mind the fact that διαθήκη is used in the LXX to render not only ברית but also דבר, "word", תורה, "law" and חוק, "statute", this raises a question of theological interpretation.[32] Is there in this a tendency to interpret ברית as a legal rather than social term? Or is there already here an attempt to identify law and covenant?[33] Or both? While it cannot be excluded that in its subsequent use διαθήκη takes on a meaning from the biblical narratives, so

---

[29] In a Greek διαθήκη has the meaning, disposition of property by will or testament. The context is legal, not religious, cf. Liddell & Scott.
This is the sense E. Kutsch, *TRE* 7, 1989, p.401, seems to impose on the LXX.

[30] A fact that has often been noted.

[31] E. Riggenbach, *Theologische Studien*, 1908, p.298, suggests an Ionic origin and prefers the sense "covenant".
Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.5-11, documents a bilateral meaning in classical Greek, such as agreement, contract ("Vertrag"), but as a rule prefers "Satzung".
J. Behm, *TDNT* II, 1964, p.126-127, suggests that διαθήκη is equivalent to ברית, that it takes on the meanings of both "covenant" and "disposition", but with a religious sense as the most prominent.
Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.311-5, points to doctrinal overtones of the interpretation, since only διαθήκη allows for the aspect of "disposition" given on a divine initiative.
Recently, Erich Gräßer, *Der alte Bund*, 1985, p.4, has interpreted διαθήκη in the LXX as divine "decree", "vor allem zur Bezeichnung für die göttliche Willenskundgebung am Sinai".

[32] See e.g. 2 Chron 25,4; Dan 9,3 (LXX) and Sir 11,20; 14,12; 16,22; 42,2; 44,20b; 45,5.7.17.24; 47,11.

[33] Cf. E. Riggenbach, Ibid., p.299; Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*,1963, p.313.
The same tendency is seen in the rabbinical identification of ברית and circumcision, cf. Erich Gräßer, Ibid., p.5.
It is also conspicuous that Josephus (in *Antiquities*) avoids the use of the term διαθήκη in biblical references and uses other terms like the unbiblical συνθήκη, cf. E. Riggenbach, p.295-97. André Paul, *NTS* 31, 1985, p.473-80, thinks Josephus is polemical, and anti-Christian.

that διαθήκη in its reception is understood to refer to both divine promise and divine decree, this can only be raised from the point of view of reception.[34] Primary to this study is the issue of whether or not the translation opens up a potential use of covenants as opposed to one covenant relationship.

While the New Testament uses διαθήκη relatively seldom, it is obvious that its authors draw on both the LXX translations of ברית and its Hebrew background.[35] In spite of it being uncommon I shall attempt an analysis of covenant as a term for identity in the Pauline letters. The relatively narrow textual basis for the terminology does not in itself indicate that the covenant concept was not part of early Christian teaching, only that it has not been preserved. It is noteworthy that, even if Paul belongs to the first generation of New Testament writers, he is probably not the first to reflect on how to use covenant conceptually and theologically.[36]

One of the main problems when analysing covenantal identity is the traditional Christian reading of two covenants into a scheme of a historical development, whereby the "old" covenant is superseded by the "new" and better covenant. This has in the past led to anti-Judaism, but, as we shall see, this is of questionable basis in the New Testament. On the other hand, covenant has been understood as a continuation and read in a salvation-historical scheme of promise and fulfilment. This involves the method of

---

[34] I shall return to this in brief comments in Chapter One, Six and Seven.

[35] There are 33 occurrences - 17 in Hebrews; 4 in the context of the Last Supper, including 1 Cor 11,25.
For a general introduction and for etymology of *diatheke* in particular, see J. Behm, *TDNT* II, 1964, p.124-29; Ernst Kutsch, *TRE* 7, 1981, p.400-401; 406; and most recently, Erich Gräßer, *Der Alte Bund*, 1985, p.1-9.
Gräßer, further, p.8-16, points to the negative report in the New Testament, the lack of the terminology in e.g. Jesus' preaching. Behind this he sees a critique of the covenant (p.10) or, possibly, a radical, new interpretation of the covenant in view of an eschatological fulfilment (cf.p.127).

[36] The two instances in Acts (3,25 and 7,8) are in a kerygmatic context of the speeches of Acts, attributed respectively to Peter and Stephen. Thus 3,25 the proclamation, "You are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God gave to your ancestors", interprets covenant as gift of God and as promise; and 7,8 uses "covenant of circumcision" in a context of inheritance to Abraham. This could be an early tradition that the author of Acts has preserved. Moreover, it is of note that, for instance, Paul's speech in Acts 13,26-41 uses vocabulary of promise to David fulfilled in Christ, but no direct covenant terminology is attributed to Paul here.
I cannot comment here on whether this is a Lucan scheme of promise and fulfilment, or there is evidence for some early kerygmatic traditions, only point to the traditions parallel to Paul.
See e.g. Nils Alstrup Dahl, in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 1968, esp. p.142.
The traditions from Hebrews are difficult to date, but they could be contemporary with Paul.

reading the Old Testament backwards from the Christ event.[37]

From a Jewish perspective the two covenants have been understood as separate relationships that exist without mutually excluding each other by focusing on the diversity of the two.[38] In an ecumenical dialogue the attempt has been made to interpret them as two complementary relationships, the one eschatological, the other historical, coexisting in diversity, and in tension.[39] Since it is possible to argue for this dualism in the Old Testament traditions, associated respectively with David and Zion and with Moses and Sinai, Paul's two covenants (Gal 4, 21-31) may also be interpreted along these lines.[40]

The alternative to this is to operate with one covenant. On the one hand, this can be taken as an exclusive relationship, limiting belonging to those who see themselves as the elect.[41] On the other,at an abstract level, the idea of one God and one creation can be taken to imply oneness. When God is seen as faithful, the one covenant is seen as "eternal", interpreted as God's universal covenant, inclusive rather than exclusive.[42] In that case there are different, complementary aspects of promise and obligation. This model I see as a challenge, especially in a context of dialogue. Thus, my question is: Is this idea of one covenant a possible ecclesiological model? If it is, how are the ecclesiological boundaries defined?

III. Determination of Boundaries.

If ecclesiological belonging is interpreted in the light of modern theology,

---

[37] See a recent exponent of this: N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991.

[38] Thus Yehezkel Kaufmann, *Christianity and Judaism*, 1988, p.1-49; Phillip Sigal, *HBT* 5, 1983, p.1-48.

[39] Thus, there is a tension between a) the historical and national covenant with Israel before the monarchy (Exodus and Joshua), and b) the eschatological and universal covenant in the Davidic tradition (2 Sam 7 and Psalms of Zion, e.g. 48, 76, 84). Salvation is respectively, contractual, dependent on mutual obligations and faithfulness and it is by divine grace, looking towards a reestablishment of creation and cosmic order. See J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *JES* 9, 1972, p.249-70.

[40] See e.g. Gijs Bouwman, *ANRW* II,25,4, 1987, p.3135-55, and further below in Chapter Six.

[41] This is how I understand "covenantal nomism". The problem with this view is that when the law is seen as the means of staying within the covenant, election and salvation, this limits covenant to law. Moreover, by interpreting covenant as a legal system contained within an ethnic identity, covenant is narrowed down at the expense of its being a wider category of relationship, or of having a universal validity.

[42] Christians may claim a participation or a sharing in the one covenant along with Israel, who may claim to be the first-born. See Monika Hellwig, *JES* 7, 1970, p.37-51, esp. p.47-49.

an insight may be gained from a modern theologian like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, because he addresses church identity by discussing the boundaries of the church.[43] Thus, for Bonhoeffer, the nature of the church, in the Reformation tradition, is not determined by those who de facto belong to it, but it is determined by the Word and sacrament of Jesus Christ. Whenever the church reflects on its boundaries it is conscious that its message and call to salvation are either accepted or rejected. When the message is not believed, boundaries are set. "It is not the church that sets the boundaries; it comes up against boundaries that are imposed upon it from the outside."[44] Because the encounter between church and unbelief always leads to an act of decision, the boundary is between salvation and its rejection. Traditionally the church has understood baptism as a determination of its boundaries, recognising both a wide sense, the validity of a baptism by desire, and a narrow sense, that lack of true belief among the baptised is reason for exclusion (p.80). However, the "true church can never give up the claim that all those baptised really belong to it, but it must at the same time concede that there are those who are not in its communion. So the church knows on the one hand a relative exterior boundary, which is given in baptism, and at the same time an inner boundary, which embraces only a part of those who have been baptised." Although Bonhoeffer is aware of the difficulty in using baptism in its traditional role as determination of church boundaries, he nevertheless maintains that baptism determines the exterior boundary. By making the distinction between an "exterior" and an "inner" boundary, he sees church membership related to a modern society. This idea has its weaknesses, although it raises some theological questions. Most important are the identity questions related to a consciousness of true and false in the ongoing inter-confessional dialogue, and the boundary questions in a contemporary situation in which boundaries need to be drawn to reflect a *status confessionis*.

Was there in the first generation church an interior boundary that marked the difference between a true and a false church? If so, Was this the same as baptism? If not, what was it? When the early Christians reinterpreted the rite of circumcision, or chose to disregard it, did they thereby exclude themselves from belonging to the Jewish community? Did they see it not as a boundary, but only as a symbol of the covenant relationship between God and

---

[43] For the following see the lecture he delivered in 1936, and published the same year in *EvTh*. It was subsequently translated into English, as The Question of the Boundaries of the Church and Church Union, and published in *The Way to Freedom*, Vol II, 1966.1972, p.75-96.
For drawing attention to Bonhoeffer I owe thanks to Anna Marie Aagaard, *Identifikation*, 1991, p.35-39.

[44] Cf. p.79.

Israel? Were they not aware that when circumcision was interpreted as not required for Gentiles, a breach inevitably took place within the community? When the early church practised baptism and saw it as essential to identity did they see it as a symbol of inclusion in a faith relationship, and not as a boundary of exclusion?

If the problem is made too dogmatic, the answer may seem to represent a false dichotomy. An alternative, and as I will hope to demonstrate, better way to proceed will be to draw on social sciences, to look specifically at ritual boundaries using sociological terminology and method as tools.

IV. Why Ritual Boundaries?

Having chosen to describe "identity" and "ritual boundaries", I need to explain the context for these terms. Both belong to social sciences, to sociology and cultural anthropology. While "identity" can be used without it being related to sociology and while "boundaries" can be used literally of geographical borderlines, and metaphorically of any demarcation line, as seen above, it is almost impossible to use "ritual boundaries" without an awareness of it being related to group identity rather than to individual self-understanding; hence it is a social term.[45]

When embarking on a sociological approach, which by no means is a novelty in New Testament scholarship,[46] I shall introduce (1) my terminology, (2) my thesis, and then, (3) refer to the relevant literature and (4) explain my method.

1) Since group identity can be found in small as well as in large communities, in groups of a few or in nations, and since it may be based on both social and religious cohesion, two basic distinctions need to be made.

First, if identity is based on national or ethnic belonging, which almost

---

[45] See Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion*, 1991, p.37 in her reference to Emile Durkheim: "Thus, by participating in group rituals, individual members renew their link with the group, and they learn and reaffirm shared meanings."
Cf. Hans Mol, *Identity*, 1976, p.166-68, who operates with three categories of identity, "personal identity", "group identity" and "social identity".

[46] Cf. the review of research given by Bengt Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament*, 1990. He not only deals with the need for sociology in New Testament studies as a way of introduction, but by giving special attention to the 1970s and 1980s he evaluates the "old consensus" and the "new consensus", and offers a criticism of the wide-spread distinction between "church" and "sect". A major objection to the use of these terms is that it is so distinctively Christian (p.109). Coined as they were by Max Weber, they appear anachronistic.
See also the two important review articles on New Testament sociological research, D.J. Harrington, *BTB* 18, 1988, p.77-85; and Stephen C. Barton, *JTS* 43, 1992, p.399-427.

always means being born into a community, a common heritage as well as shared norms, rites and beliefs express the cohesion of the nation or people. As a way of describing the religious basis and the integration of a society, Meredith B. McGuire uses the term "civil religion", a term she applies to the modern American society with its diverse ethnic and religious groups in particular.[47] The common space, common beliefs, common ethical norms and a shared lifestyle are pertinent to "civil religion" and constitute the unity of the people in many societies.[48] I shall apply "civil religion" to ancient societies, including Ancient Israel, and the Jewish people at the time of Jesus, because, then as now, a society which has a set of beliefs, rites, symbols and values in common may be defined in terms of a "civil religion".[49] This is particularly the case when a people sees itself united as the people of God.

Second, if identity is based not on ethnic criteria but on the individual's choice of group membership, then the common ethnic heritage is no longer of the same importance. Instead, the shared beliefs and norms create a sense of group solidarity and consolidate the unity of the group. If a religious group sees itself as the only legitimate religion, claiming that other groups with different beliefs and norms are illegitimate religions or have false beliefs, the term "religious particularism" applies.[50] A particularistic view is not only intolerant of others outside the group, but is liable also to cause conflicts and enhance disunity within the group itself. I shall use "particularism" because it has the advantage over other terms, such as sectarianism, in that it is less anachronistic, and thus more suitable as a term for group belonging in societies in antiquity.[51] It can be used to describe groups that look on themselves as the only true heirs to tradition, the rightful recipients of God's revelation, of the real manifestation of truth. A particularistic understanding of being the people of God, or belonging to the covenant, has a tendency to transcend national and ethnic belonging, or even to spiritualize social belonging. In its extreme

---

[47] Cf. *Religion*, 1991, p.179-81. "Civil religion" was used before McGuire by e.g. Robert N. Bellah, *Beyond Belief*, 1970; originally it was coined by Jean Jacques Rousseau.

[48] In a pluralistic society something other than religion form the basis for unity, cf. Keith A. Roberts, *Religion*, 1990, p.342.

[49] Cf. Keith A. Roberts, *Religion*, 1990, p.348, referring to the Roman Empire being united through a common worship of the Emperor.

[50] See Meredith B. McGuire, Ibid. p.190-91.

[51] "Sect" and "sectarian", is neither very accurate, nor appropriate, for a first century church, as noted by Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion*, 1991, p.133-142. That the terms are in common usage among New Testament scholars, does not justify a continuous use.

form "particularism" is, as an expression of individualism, a threat to the sociality[52] of a group, since it is conflict orientated.[53]

Where conflicts occur, boundaries are either drawn externally to exclude outside influence, or drawn internally as a means of dealing with unacceptable behaviour or beliefs. This can mean separation, exclusion of those who deviate from what is acceptable by the larger group. In other words, internal disagreements (in terms of heresy, orthodoxy and orthopraxy) as well as external conflicts (in terms of apostasy and enmity) both call for identity *and* boundaries to be defined or redefined in order to decide what the foundation of the shared identity *is* and what the borderline for acceptability is. Simultaneously, the relation to marginal groups and individuals becomes a matter of importance. Marginality makes belonging into transitional belonging.[54] Because marginal groups suffer from a lack of inclusion, the problem of marginality needs to be dealt with and responded to.[55] Thus new principles for belonging or rites of entry must be created to structure a transition from a status of marginality to a status of belonging. How a group defines marginality and solves the problem of transitionality are closely tied to the question of how it defines identity and draws boundaries as either inclusive or exclusive borderlines.

True social identity is almost unimaginable if not ethnic (national) or particularistic, partly because language (and country) is basic to a person's identity, partly because self-understanding is grounded in shared events related to smaller groups. While rituals in general mark a change of social identity either because they mark a change within the community related to maturity or to change of status within the community, entrance rites, in particular, signify that an exit from one group and an entry to another takes place, as "separation, transition and aggregation".[56] While

---

[52] When I use the abstract term "sociality" I refer to the quality or state of being social, similar to the way mutuality refers to the quality of being mutual.

[53] A theological particularism has a tendency to establish high boundaries for belonging, cf. Keith A. Roberts, *Religion*, 1990, p.64.

[54] Marginality is best defined in reference to individuals or groups who, for any reason, stand on the boundary of the larger society, or other groups, cf. Hans Mol, *Identity*, 1976, p.31.

[55] Both Old Testament society and Judaism were engaged in a discussion on how to deal with marginal groups, their inclusion and participation in the society, which continues into and beyond the New Testament, cf. Hans Mol, *Identity*, 1976, p.37-8.

[56] This expression was first coined by Arnold van Gennep in 1909.
Another useful systematic approach is found in Mircea Eliade, *Rites and Symbols* 1958, 1975, p.2, and in *RGG*[3] III, 1959, p.751. Eliade suggests three main types: (a) collective rites for all in a community, e.g. puberty rites;

they function as a means of defining the social boundary of the community, they also proclaim that identity is group commitment.[57] Since boundaries express both social and religious self-awareness - manifest in beliefs, rites, norms etc. - they define the ground of a shared identity and are the fundamental basis for self-definition.[58]

2) It is my thesis - and the following pages purport to give the documentation for this conclusion - that the characteristic identity features of a group, the basic forms of socio-religious belonging, are mirrored by the entrance rites, and that the reciprocity between group identity and the character of established boundaries can be traced in the Old Testament, in the intertestamental literature and in the Pauline texts. To be specific, in Judaism the rite of circumcision designates covenantal belonging and identity; in some cases, covenantal belonging is defined by birth, but nevertheless marked by a rite of affirmation; and in other cases, covenantal belonging is defined in more narrow categories of commitment, so that belonging is by choice, marked as it is by a rite of entry or a conversion rite. To Paul, both Christian and social identity find a ritual expression in the rite of baptism, marking entry into the church. If the sociality of the church is symbolically expressed in and through an entry rite, this presupposes that entrance rites do not simply symbolise the individual's entry to a community. Entrance rites rather express a change in social identity. Because they are rites of crossing a boundary, and mark becoming part of a community, they serve as a means to differentiate socially one group from another.

3) No previous attempt has been made to link the two terms "covenantal identity" and "ritual boundaries" with the purpose of explaining the interdependence between social and ecclesiological identity and entry rites. The relation between "getting in" and "staying in" is posed as a question by E.P. Sanders, in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 1977, but the answer given is disappointing. He fails to consider that entry rites, both Pauline baptism and the purity rites in the Dead Sea Scrolls, have an ecclesiological

---

(b) entry rites, not obligatory, e.g. as introduction to secret society; and (c) magical-mystical vocation rites, e.g. to be tribal medicine-men (or women). A common phenomenon, according to Eliade, of initiation rites is the change of status. Cf. *Rites and Symbols*, p.x.
See also Peter Gerlitz, *TRE* 16, 1987, p.156-62.

[57] Groups can be defined in ethnic, religious or ideological categories, cf. Hans Mol, Ibid., p.166-83.

[58] Thus Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion*, 1991, p.27: "Religion represents an important tie between the individual and the larger social group, both as a *basis of association* and as an *expression of shared meanings.*" (Author's italic.)

function. His use of transfer terminology, such as participation in the death of Christ, does not appear to give weight to the rites that mark "getting in". This is in part dictated by his concern with soteriological rather than ecclesiological issues. Even when focusing on "staying in" he seems to overlook an important social aspect that could feed into the discussion on baptism.

Already in 1979, Wayne A. Meeks in an interesting article and later in 1983, in *The First Urban Christians*, pointed to the link between the practice of baptism and boundaries in the Pauline churches. Although he makes the important observation that baptism has a social function, his treatment of rituals is weakened by concentrating on reconstruction of a baptismal rite in which death and resurrection are symbolically expressed. It is problematic when baptism is defined as a symbolic boundary, since it weakens the social dimension considerably. While a symbolic boundary suggests a symbolic crossing, as from a material to a spiritual sphere, a social boundary suggests crossing a border line that divides between groups, having either different concepts of identity, ethnic or particularistic, or marking a border line for change of status, a "no longer" identity over against a "now".

The most recent contribution to the discussion is Alan F. Segal's, *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*, 1990.[59] While Segal defines conversion as a religious experience that effects a transformation, he interprets baptism as a rite that signifies change of status in relation to purity within the group. Since for Segal Paul's conversion is not in opposition to his being a Jew, nor is it a change of ethnic identity, his category of belonging as ethnic belonging is a broad category so that he fails to recognise baptism as the mark of an external boundary. Hence baptism is effectively a ritual for personal transformation, but not a rite of entry.

I shall challenge these and other views when I return to circumcision and baptism in Chapter Seven.

4) In the social sciences there are several models that can be used as tools in biblical interpretation. Bruce Malina[60] divides these into three: (1) the structural-functional model, that seeks to explain society from the point of

---

[59] Baptism is only treated in passing, but his view of baptism is to a certain extent in line with Wayne A. Meeks.

[60] Further details and documentation in *The Bible and Liberation*, 1983, p.11-25. There are of course other models, cf. Gerd Theissen, *Sociology*, 1978, 1982.

view of order and harmony;[61] (2) the conflict model that focuses on society from the angle of change and conflict;[62] (3) the symbolic interaction model that interprets social behaviour as grounded in a shared social and/or cultural meaning- and value-system.[63] Each model has something to contribute to biblical studies, and to limit oneself to one of these models seems a less fruitful way forward. The most important contribution from the social sciences is that they offer explanations of human, social behaviour, of how and why individuals and groups behave typically. This means that one can describe and analyse behaviour patterns, and seek to explain their rationale.

Having thus explained the main reasons for approaching covenant and its ritual boundary markers, the sociological perspective I choose, and the ecclesiological terms I wish to use, I am now in a position to address the question of theological implications.

V. Choice of Texts.

I set as my task to look at the two issues, identity and boundaries, within a context of Judaism at the time before the Christian era. This means I shall analyse texts, ranging in time and genre with both a "civil religious" and a "particularistic" point of view, from the Old Testament, the Book of Jubilees, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. The choice of texts represents, as we shall see, various groups with different sets of principles for belonging. The two issues will be treated in the context of each chosen text in order to clarify the meaning and use of the covenant idea, especially as this is related to identity and boundaries. And when one of these two issues is not found, this is a reason for not going into a detailed analysis of a text, such as Pseudo-Philo.[64] Although the covenant idea plays an important role in Pseudo-Philo, covenant identity being tied to the people of Israel as the stories of covenant promises show,[65] never-

---

[61] For this approach, see Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, 1980. Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 1979. Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, 1978.

[62] See John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community*, 1975.

[63] See Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World*, 1981.

[64] Pseudo-Philo, or *Liber Antiquitatum*, dating from first century A.D. with translation and notes, see: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha II, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 1983.

[65] To Noah (PsPh 3), to Abraham (PsPh 8), to Amran when the birth of Moses is announced (PsPh 9), to Moses (PsPh 19), to Joshua (PsPh 20-24) and to Kenaz (PsPh 25-28). The extensive treatment of Kenaz is remarkable, not only because he is merely a name in Judg 3,9.11, but especially because Kenaz is representative of the tribe of Judah. The implication is that the royal covenant is given priority over the priestly covenant. However, the story

theless covenant entry is not at issue.[66] Neither a rite of affirmation nor of entrance plays a role in this retold history running from Creation to the time of David.

Part A will be a conceptual study of covenantal identity and boundary rites in the Old Testament. Here I shall consider the main covenant motifs. Part B will continue the discussion and identify questions relevant to a study of Paul from intertestamental writers with a brief look at the significance of the baptism of John. I shall pursue both covenant consciousness and awareness of boundaries and demonstrate how and why both change. And in Part C I shall analyse covenant and ritual boundaries in Paul's letters by focusing on covenant, baptism and circumcision. Finally in my conclusion I shall attempt to answer the question of the necessity of baptismal boundaries.

The texts chosen range from what may be termed the "normative" and inclusive - civil religious - Judaism (Old Testament and the Book of Jubilees) to the heterodox and exclusive - particularistic - Dead Sea Scrolls (the Temple Scroll, the Damascus Document and the Community Rule). Since it is widely recognised that in these texts we find some sort of community described, that the covenant term is used directly for this purpose, and that there is a concern for purity which may be interpreted as a boundary issue, the choice is obvious. However, since my approach has an orientation towards both continuity and discontinuity, I need to take the entire text into account rather than look at representative sections, or fragments of texts, consequently I shall deal with the three texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls separately and not attempt to give a comprehensive view of one community behind all texts. Thus, I shall demonstrate not only, that there is a process in the way self-understanding is expressed but also that this process is related to a covenantaL theology. Furthermore, from the point of view of how these texts reflect a changing identity they become witnesses to how new boundaries are introduced.

In a way the relation between circumcision and baptism is not a new issue, but when I attempt to explain the relation in terms of a pattern of interdependence, to look at the change in terminology and symbolic terms in the New Testament, I hope it will be clear that the introduction of a baptismal rite reflects a radical change in identity, a change in social identity and in theology. Since I understand New Testament baptism to be not simply a

---

breaks off with David and the possibility of an apology for a royal covenant (cf. PsPh 56,2) cannot be confirmed because of the lack of textual evidence.

[66] Boundaries are defined as moral and ethical laws, and related to sin which again is defined as idolatry and mixed marriages, see e.g. PsPh 18, 21, 30, 41, 43, 44 and 64.

rite or act related to the individual, but rather a rite that belongs to a community, the self-understanding of the community, its ecclesiology, becomes fundamental. I hope that by analysing Paul's use of baptismal terminology I can show that, depending on how the Christian community is defined, boundaries are defined to mark the limits for acceptance, either as rites of entry, or as marks of belonging. This means that I choose to disregard Paul's interpretation of baptism as death with Christ in Romans 6,3-4. The reason for this is that in Romans 6 Paul gives a limited interpretation of baptism; the ecclesiological dimension is lacking as the play on death in Christ is tied to the eschatological aspect of baptism. My questions in addressing the Pauline material can now be phrased, What is the shared Christian identity to which the rite of baptism leads? What constitutes Christian group belonging? How are the social and religious boundaries drawn? To limit baptism to its initiatory function simultaneously raises the questions, What does baptism as a rite symbolise? What is the character of baptism and why did the first Christians choose baptism as a boundary rite?

VI. Conclusion.

When general sociological questions are applied to ancient texts, the problem is to be aware of the nature and the limits of the material. From a historical point of view a development has taken place, when the Israelite religion of the Old Testament evolved into Judaism. But this development involves a social and theological change that antedates Christianity. Both ethnic and particularistic identity motifs are attested to in Judaism in antiquity and in early Christianity, and both the Jewish and the Christian community wrestled with the question of self-understanding. If the changed identity is seen only in the historical context, the problem is limited to a historical explanation. To some extent, I suppose, a historical answer to why identity and boundaries change, could be a satisfactory explanation. However, because both Judaism in antiquity and early Christianity looked upon the past as more than history and because both interpreted the past as God's revelation to humankind, as God's acting with a people, theological answers to questions of historical change follow invariably. By posing the problem as a boundary and identity issue I wish to explain the emergence of baptism against the shift in identity and boundaries in social terms. Instead of a critique of sacramentalism and an emphasis on individual faith, I see the significance of baptism exposed when baptism is seen as a rite that symbolises not only an individual's entry into a group through choice of that group's beliefs, traditions, norms etc., but as a rite by means of which the church constitutes itself as a social community. It goes without saying that baptism also symbolises an individual's identification with

Christ whose post-resurrection presence is manifest in the church.

The value of this study is, I hope, that I can analyse the issues from a different perspective and explain the rationale for the shift in rites by showing that the pattern of change in identity and boundaries is present already in intertestamental Judaism, and can be traced also in Pauline Christianity. The theology of baptism, moreover, is solidified in its interpretation as a rite of identification and incorporation, as well as a rite marking change of identity.

PART A

THE OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND

FOR

COVENANT IDENTITY AND ITS BOUNDARIES.

CHAPTER ONE.

SOME OLD TESTAMENT ASPECTS TO COVENANTAL IDENTITY AND BOUNDARIES.

The aim of this first chapter is to establish what the Old Testament foundation of covenant identity and boundaries is by giving particular attention to identity, defined through covenantal stories and to boundaries as they are given concrete ritual forms. I shall provide a broad Old Testament context and background to the specific identity and boundary questions to emerge in Part B, the Book of Jubilees and texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Part C, the genuine letters of Paul. These writings all presuppose an Old Testament background, not least when traditions are reinterpreted in their communities to answer the specific question, "Where do we come from?" Their concern for interpreting covenantal validity by referring to the "eternal covenant" reflects a topical interest in the Old Testament traditions of covenantal belonging in general, and covenantal boundaries in particular.

When one looks at the covenant with reference to identity, the stories of prominent figures, such as Noah, Abraham, and David, and central events, like that of Sinai, or the occupation of the land must be reexamined. This is fundamental when an attempt is made to establish to what degree there is a pattern of interdependence between covenant and its boundaries. Further, the traditions which associate covenant with the Levites in general and with Phinehas in particular need to be reconsidered, since the particularistic understanding of a priestly covenant is reflected in this story. As for the prophetic writings, the actual covenant terminology is used relatively little; nevertheless, they contain the explicit hope for a renewed relationship with God, and are therefore vital to identity. They provide one of the answers to the question, "Where are we going?".

In order to trace a pattern of interdependence between covenant identity and boundaries I have chosen four covenant aspects which I shall treat in (1) divine presence, (2) covenant promises, (3) the obligatory covenant and (4) covenant restoration, and relate these to their respective boundaries. These four aspects represent and reflect a wider understanding of the covenant than that found in E.P. Sanders' term, "covenantal nomism".[1] His insight that keeping the law is integral to what constitutes the covenant is soteriologically based. The danger, however, in this view is that keeping the law becomes the essential condition for a covenant relationship, so that

---

[1] Cf. Introduction, note 2.

promise is, if not overlooked, at least secondary. It is theologically problematic that the main emphasis is on a soteriological interpretation of covenant, election and law, in which case covenant cannot also function as an ecclesiological term. Since a horizontal relationship established by God is inconceivable without attention to both promises and obligations, it seems rather more balanced and legitimate to view promises and obligations as juxtaposed aspects, as marks of a mutually binding relationship.[2] Whether promise and law are interpreted as interdependent, complementary or in tension, depends on how narrowly or broadly covenantal belonging is defined.

Rather than limit myself to the two perspectives, law and promise, I add another two. The first is the covenant guarantee which I see expressed in the idea of divine presence and in the holiness issue. The purpose is to draw attention to the theological dimension, especially to the idea that covenant is guaranteed validity and that boundaries are God-given. Secondly, I wish to include the idea of a broken and restored covenant. The latter focuses on covenant continuity as important to identity since it raises the fundamental question of Israel's rights. The questions here are, whether a "new" covenant is essentially the same as the "old", maybe extended in scope, or whether a "new" covenant, radically different from the "old" covenant, replaces or abolishes it. While possibly too broad as categories, these four aspects nevertheless provide a useful point of departure for inquiring about covenantal identity and ritual boundaries in Palestinian Judaism and Pauline Christianity.[3]

But first, let me briefly explain my approach when interpreting the Old Testament.

I. Interpreting the Old Testament.

In this study the object is not that of presenting a historical development of the covenant concept in Old Testament times. Rather, I shall approach the Old Testament holistically, and prefer a thematic interpretation, well

---

[2] See M. Weinfeld, *JAOS* 90, 1970, and *ThWAT* I, 1973. He distinguishes between (a) the obligatory covenant and (b) the promissory, based respectively on covenant as political treaty of the Hittite type and on covenant as grant compared to a Near-Eastern royal grant. When this is applied to the Old Testament, two main types are mirrored, the obligatory covenant with Israel over against the promissory covenant especially with Abraham and David.
A variant of the promissory and obligatory covenants is found in Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 1985, who writes from a Jewish perspective.

[3] For a parallel use of a broader term, see Lars Hartman who uses "covenant ideology" (Bundesideologie) and operates with a pattern of thought. See, in *Die paulinische Literatur*, 1980, p.105-7.

knowing that such a view of the Old Testament is not an easy task. My task is to describe the patterns of identity which have a bearing on the drawing of boundaries. For this approach it is important to bear in mind that when writers in Judaism in antiquity, including the New Testament writers, look at the Old Testament they read it as a unity, as an end-product of a development; moreover, as God's revelation. When these writers use the Old Testament, historical questions are interpreted in the light of how they reflect the divine plan and will, and not looked at in chronological terms. Thus, contemporary questions in antiquity, such as those related to identity and boundaries, are answered with reference to Old Testament traditions. The Old Testament heritage is seen as normative, yet in need of reinterpretation. The Old Testament is thus the foundation for a consciousness of covenant identity and boundaries, the basis for sharing the same symbolic world.

For a thematic approach I find the phenomenological approach of Johs. Pedersen useful. He views the Old Testament, that is, Israel's religion and society, as a totality.[4] He regards covenant as a metaphor for relationship with God which involves also a social dimension.[5] This means, then, that the covenant is one of the most fundamental categories of identity, because, "one is born of a covenant and into a covenant, and wherever one moves in life, one makes a covenant or acts on the basis of the already existing covenant".[6] It is significant that when Israel sees itself as a people bound together in what is termed God's covenant, and when further a future, fuller realisation of the covenant is expected by the people, Israel's identity consists of a common history and tradition, of shared values, norms and rituals, but also of a common life and a common goal of the people.[7]

In the particular case of covenantal belonging a thematic approach entails that one sees the Old Testament and its concrete covenant stories in

---

[4] *Israel*, I-II, 1926, III-IV, 1940, repr.1959.
Helpful is also the theological approach of Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I-II, 1961-67, because he provides a comprehensive view of the covenant as a fundamental idea of the Old Testament, although he tends to include too wide a range of religion as covenantal.

[5] Cf. ibid., p.309: "The covenant is creator of all rights and duties. Therefore it is identical with right and duty, even of the least privilege or the least duty the Israelite can say that it *is* the covenant, for the covenant is present in it."

[6] Cf. *Israel*, I-II, 1926. 1959, p.308.

[7] This is also termed, "blessing" and "peace", both important aspects of the covenant life. Peace for the people is a hope for the future based on past promises from God, which in some cases implies a right to dominion over other peoples, see, ibid., p.311-29.

sequence, so that for instance, the covenant with Abraham (Gen 12,1-9; 15; 17,1-14) is taken as prior to the covenant with Moses (Ex 19-24, restored in 34). Thereby the later covenants appear to make the former covenant(s) more complete, but viewed as one coherent revelation. A reappropriaton of traditions is found already in the use of covenant and covenants in the LXX version of Sir 44-47 in which two nuances emerge. On the one hand, an awareness of God's "covenant" with humanity is present as an almost abstract relationship, and on the other hand, we find a concrete relationship that is manifest in particular "covenants", in promises and laws.[8] Thus, the covenantal relationships (with Noah cf. 44,18, Abraham cf. 44,20 and Jacob cf. 44,23) seem to refer to concrete events, while the uses of "eternal covenant" for Aaron (cf. 45,15), the "covenant of peace" established with Phinehas (cf. 45,24), and the exclusive covenant with David (45,25) seem to focus more on covenant as a national heritage in abstract terms.[9] This dual use will be even more obvious for the writers in the intertestamental period and in Paul.

When the Old Testament is read from a holistic perspective as one coherent past tradition, the covenant relationship may be seen as one covenant, taking on a variety of forms; fundamental to this, then, is the belief that there is one God whose presence guarantees that the covenant is valid and that covenantal boundaries express limits of divine presence. Relationship with God is reassessed in terms of self-understanding, as ethnic or particularistic belonging. It is expressed either in broad categories of belonging by birth or in narrow categories of decision. Despite differences of interpretative method, there is a common factor to all these writers: the authority of the Old Testament revelation.[10]

It will become obvious that when boundaries too are reinterpreted, either in broad terms of necessary rites securing the covenant or in narrow terms setting limits for entering, the fundamental symbolic value is taken over

---

[8] Cf. Ernmst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.111.

[9] According to Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.33, the covenant with David concerns the people, not just David personally. She also points out, p.39, that the Davidic covenant is inferior to the priestly, Levitical covenant, obvious when the office is defined thus: προστατεῖν ἁγίων καὶ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, "to be leader of the sanctuary and of his people", and when the title (used first time in Jewish literature) is, ἱερωσύνης μεγαλεῖος, "to have the dignity of the priesthood (forever)", Sir 45,24. Unlike the Davidic covenant, the covenant with Aaron is inclusive of all descendants, thus of priesthood in general.

[10] That the Old Testament is a common factor means that a canonical status prior to the fixation of the canon can be presupposed. See, Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Utterances*, 1983, p.7-26.

from the Old Testament world. Here again I draw attention to Johs. Pedersen who operates with covenant tokens, which he takes as signs that point beyond themselves to the power and reality behind symbolic action or symbolic events. Thus he states: "The rainbow, the circumcision, the sabbath are tokens carrying the covenant in them".[11] Rightly understood, "tokens" are more than symbols, they are signs that embody presence of the divine power. The reason for understanding these tokens as signs of the covenant reality is found in the idea that the covenant reality is recognised in the sign, the sign is identified with this reality. Instead of "covenant tokens" I prefer the terminology "boundary marks" for reasons I have given above in my Introduction. I shall look at boundary marks as they function, in much the same way as "tokens", as the concrete rituals that affirm and maintain belonging, or are rites of entry.

II. Covenantal Identity and Boundaries: Born to Belong.

By taking a holistic view I shall look first at the covenants established with Noah and Abraham as predominantly promissory relationships. It is noteworthy that these events simultaneously point forward to the obligatory covenant of Moses, or to a renewed relationship. Although the Sinaitic covenant understands covenant primarily as a law relationship it clearly presupposes the divine promises and contains other aspects, such as eternal validity. Besides, the idea of a broken covenant, or a "new" covenant cannot be appreciated without both the promissory and the obligatory aspects of previous establishments. Each covenant establishment suggests a ritual or symbol marking the boundary of the covenant.

(1) Divine Presence Guarantees Covenant and Boundaries.

Previous scholarship has not given sufficient attention to the motif of God's presence and its significance, although it runs through virtually all the covenant stories.[12] Two points need to be made. First, there is a general tendency in the texts to stress that the covenant is established on God's initiative: God commands, and the divine decree brings the covenant into existence. Secondly, we note that the particular manifestations of God's

---

[11] Ibid., p.169. The context to which a sign or a token points is important, thus he continues: "A cord in a window (Josh 2,12) may be a token. A stone may be a token of a compact between human beings (Gen 31) or with God (Josh 24,27). An unusual event is a sign indicating an underlying mighty power of the soul (Exod 4,8.9.17 ff.; 7,3; Deut 4,34 et al.). The signs or tokens are realities; they are not naked things nor facts which are nothing but symbols or indications of some underlying element. The contents of the soul are manifested in them and fill them. If one spoils the token, then the mental implication is broken."

[12] An exception is Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, chapters V-VII.

presence in various narratives serve different purposes. A number of images used for the presence of God have the clear purpose of describing who God is, how God becomes manifest and present, but also why God enters into a covenant relationship. From an overall perspective, the issue is: without a record of the presence of God and a subsequent belief in the divine origin of the covenant, the covenant would not be of special value, nor be an identifying factor.

Whether a narrative recalls the divine presence by depicting an anthropomorphic God who communicates by means of a spoken word, by accentuating an elaborate theophanic experience, or by recalling a God who speaks through a mediator, makes no real difference to the fundamental idea that God's presence creates a boundary defined by this presence. Hence covenant relationship with God is founded in and formed by a belief that God is manifest to the people as holiness, fidelity, righteousness, mercy and love. Boundaries are created in response to this belief.[13] I shall illustrate this by looking at the three stories associating divine origin of the covenant with (a) Noah, (b) Abraham, and (c) Moses.[14]

(a) One Covenant with Noah. The first account of covenant in Genesis is the story of God establishing the covenant with Noah but intended for humanity.[15] In Gen 6,18 ברית appears for the first time in the Old Testament. God promises to make a covenant. Then, in Gen 9,1-17 a covenant with Noah is made, containing God's promise not to destroy the earth again. This promise serves primarily as a guarantee for a continuation of creation.

Two things are important. First, the expression that God will or may remember the covenant (v.15-17). The function of God's remembering is to point to the fact that once established the covenant will be confirmed by God, reenacted for humanity at any time God "remembers" it.[16] Secondly, the "sign of the covenant" (v.12-17), a rainbow, is set as a visible sign, set

---

[13] Further details in Helmer Ringgren's, *Israelite Religion*, 1966, p.66-88.

[14] I shall return to the covenant with Abraham below in II (2) (a).

[15] All through Genesis God is envisaged anthropomorphically: God acts, speaks, remembers etc.; so when God in Genesis 6,18; 9,9.11 promises to give a covenant, the language used is "establish", הקים, which has the divine initiative as presupposition.
The covenant is specified here as the covenant "between God and every living creature of all flesh that is on the earth" cf. 9,16.

[16] "Keeping" the covenant is expressed with the verbs, נצר, שמר to "keep" but also זכר, to "remember", "recollect", "call to mind", cf M. Weinfeld, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.788-9.
When Gen 9,15 uses זכר, the idea is that when God remembers the covenant the divine will is given a new direction, towards a new action, cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.106-7.

for God and by God, assuring humanity that God's covenant is valid.

One purpose of the story is to identify God in terms of fidelity, mercy and love. On the basis of a belief that God not only established the covenant once, but also restores the covenant by remembering it, or renews it, a belief is sustained that covenant relationships will exist and continue to be valid into the future.[17] Simultaneously, the story points backwards to creation, because of the image of God as creator God, maintained both in God's promise never again to curse the earth or destroy living creatures, and in God's blessing to "be fruitful and multiply".[18] The narrative link between past, present and future serves to guarantee the presence of the power of God in and for the world. The universal note is clear.

Since the Noah story also contains the notion of an "eternal covenant", this raises the question of the identity of this particular relationship.[19] "Eternal" recalls the blessings of creation by referring to "be fruitful and multiply" (9,7). Simultaneously there is an orientation towards the future. By focusing on covenant validity the story expresses a hope of renewal.[20] It is noteworthy that the narrow perspective of election is not yet present, mainly because the receiving party is not only Noah and his descendants, but every living creature. Because the Noah story is essentially a tradition about one, eternal covenant established with humanity, it contains an aspect of universality, humanity after creation, and of totality, God's concern for the world.[21] This covenant is unique in that it is inclusive, and has boundaries set by God in creation. God's sign, the rainbow, is for humanity. It serves to ensure validity. Because the rainbow, given by God, functions

---

[17] Note that זכר is both an abstract term and a concrete act, it contains both past, present and future, and has the connotation of both remembering with mercy and love and acting accordingly, cf. Ps 105,8; 106,45; 111,5.
See, Heinz-Josef Fabry in *Freude*, 1983, p.177-87, esp. p.186: "Gottes *zakar* setzt also den uranfänglich gestifteten Bund neu in Kraft und bestätigt so die von ihm eröffnete Gemeinschaft mit dem Bundesvolk in der aktueller Gegenwart."
For a good overview see H. Eising, *TDOT* IV, 1980, p.64-82, who defines *zakar* thus: "it denotes an active cognitive occupation with a person or a situation".

[18] Parallel to the creation story in Gen 1,28-29.

[19] The adjective עולם is also used for God, e.g. Gen 21,33, Isa 40,28, for the absoluteness in the nature of God.
I return to ברית עולם, "eternal" covenant, below, in (4).

[20] The expression in Gen 9,16, ברית עולם, points forward to Gen 17,7, 2 Sam 7,16 and 25,29. Of note is the use of this expression in Exod 31,12-17. Here the Sabbath is a covenant sign functioning as a reminder that a day is set apart for God, but not a mark of identification of the people, cf. Michael V. Fox, *RB* 81, 1974, esp. p.575-78.

[21] Cf. Sirach 44,12.18.

as God's universal sign of hope for humanity, as a covenant sign it functions as a divine guarantee of the one covenant relationship for the future.

(b) God's Covenant Oath to Abraham. In Genesis 15 we find another example of the idea that covenant terms are laid down by God and for God. Here the promise of a covenant is tied to the ritual or symbolic act, the cutting up of sacrificial animals and placing them against each other (v.9-10). God alone acts and sets the terms.[22] The climax of this story is found in the image of God as "a smoking fire pot and a flaming torch" (15,17). By means of these nature symbols the writer points to the powerful presence of God, who in an act can consume, hence destroy. The story also develops the idea that God is a covenant partner who as such accepts the consequences of failing to fulfil the given promises.[23] No obligations are laid on Abraham in this story. Rather, in and behind this story of God swearing an oath, thereby evoking a self-curse, there is the idea of God who guarantees a future for Abraham, who acts out a covenant promise.

The ritual has God as acting person. It is performed as a sign, and the consuming fire functions as an illustration to God being guarantor for the covenant. It is a sign that reminds God of the covenant. By its very nature it cannot be repeated. Although Abraham is portrayed as a trusting and believing figure, or as righteous,[24] in a way as representative of the future people, the focus is not on this. Nor is there a focus on covenant identified narrowly as election. Rather, there is a future orientation because God's promise of a specific land clearly serves to identify a place in which the people some time in future will be limited by God-given boundaries; hence the promise of geographical boundaries.[25] Covenant validity is thus maintained.

(c) The Divine Presence at Sinai. In the accounts of the Sinai covenant

---

[22] According to whether the focus is on God or Abraham, the rite can be interpreted as divine oath or human sacrifice.
See Meredith G. Kline, *WThJ* 27, 1964, p.1-20, esp. p.3-4, who, with a theological approach, concludes that God's oath is a ratification of a covenant of promise. And Ernst Kutsch, *THAT* I, 1971, col.343 and *TRE* 7, 1981, p.399, interprets this story in relation to his own definition of *berith* always meaning obligation, so that Gen 15 becomes an example of a self-obligation (Selbstverpflichtung) that God undertakes.
For a sacrificial view see S.E. Loewenstamm, *VT* 18, 1968, p.500-7.

[23] Cf. G.E. Mendenhall, *IDB* I, 1962, p.718.

[24] Gen 15,6; 22,12; Sir 44,19-21.

[25] In Gen 15,18-21, the land promised is specified by its boundaries. Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.476: "The country of man and the people are so closely linked that their creation coincides".

nature symbols are used to describe God's presence.[26] God appears in Exodus in clouds or smoke (e.g. 20,18; 24,15-18). Of prime interest here is the way God's presence points to God as guarantor of the covenant relationship, as told in the two theophany stories (19-31 and 33-34). The stories identify God in this way, by "name", visible as glory, and manifest in power or holiness.[27] The two stories are separated by the incident of the Golden Calf (32).

Read holistically, Exodus 19-31 illustrates clearly that the people's identity is dependent both on God's action and its own awareness thereof. The story begins with an experience of God, encountered in a cloud (19,9; cf. 24,16-18), in thunder and lightning, fire, smoke and earthquake (19,18), heard as the divine voice (20,21-22), that is God is manifest as power (of nature). These metaphors express not only that God is Lord over nature, but also that God's presence and power can be recognised by the people in these phenomena.[28] The story points to a distant, hidden and unapproachable God, as the account of the death penalty for crossing into the territory of God (19,12) shows. Distance must be respected, because God is ultimate holiness. And because God is perceived as holy, as otherness, a boundary to separate from God is set by God (19,12.23). An act of purification must be performed before approaching the presence and holiness of God (19,10-15). While the people remained at a distance (Exod 19,17; 24,1-2. 18-21), Moses, Aaron (Nadab, Abihu and seventy of the elders) came closer, worshipped, ate and drank in God's presence (24,1-11). The significance of the symbolic use of blood in 24,8 is that by means of this ritual the people affirms the covenant. Of note is the remark, "they saw the God of Israel" (24,10), because such a direct encounter with God is unique in the context.[29] After the ceremony Moses alone entered the cloud of the presence of God (24,15-18), where God spoke with Moses and gave him the two tablets "written with the finger of God" (31,18 cf. 32,16).

The story is broken off with the account of the apostasy of the people who

---

[26] A parallel is found in Deuteronomy 1-33.

[27] The name substitutes the personal presence, and it stands for power, cf. Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.207. Glory is a cosmic attribute to God, designating ultimate holiness, Ibid., p.277.

[28] See G. Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament* 1950, p.21-22, following Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.662.

[29] Ernest W. Nicholson, *God*, 1986, p.121-33, interprets historically and concludes, p.130, that Exod 24 is a story of covenant ratification, as "a theophany tradition, a tradition of a *visio dei*, the most remarkable in the Old Testament".
Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.45, prefers to see Exod 24 in a context of the covenant as sacred meal, a mutual contractual rite.

by worshipping the Golden calf had broken the covenant. This event resulted in God's anger (32,10). However, on Moses' intervention "God changed his mind about the disaster that he had planned to bring on his people" (32,14). The people was therefore not destroyed in spite of its sin. A powerful God is also pictured as mercy and love.

The second theophany in Exodus 33-34 must be seen against the background of 32, the broken covenant. The seriousness of the apostasy is evident from the fact that Moses commands the Levites to go through the camp and kill, an act which clearly symbolises God's punishment of the people (32,25-35). Essentially this passage contains the story of the making of the second set of the tablets of the law.[30] This time Moses, not God, wrote "the words of the covenant" (34,28).[31] With this the relationship between God and the people is reestablished, and the giving of these tablets serve as a sign that a restoration has taken place.[32] This interpretation is also supported by the renewed terms, found in Exod 34,10-28.[33] Although it is significant that when God commands Moses to make two new tablets "like the former ones", that they contain the same words as the former (Exod 34,1.4), there are also changes, as we shall see. From the point of view of identity, the story confirms Israel's status as a people belonging to God, although it brings to consciousness that a violation of God's covenant has taken place. As the story stands, it points both backwards to the already made covenants with Abraham and Noah, and the covenant established in 19-31 and forwards to future broken covenants. Thus it functions in the overall event to reestablish the laws of 20-24 and is simultaneously a sign of hope for future forgiveness. Finally, this passage communicates that God is guarantor for all covenant relationships of forgiveness, in spite of human sin.

One change to note is this: although Moses is given the privilege of seeing

---

[30] The first pair of tablets were destroyed by Moses, cf. 32,19.

[31] According to 34,27, God made a covenant "with you and with Israel". This marks a shift in comparison with Exod 24,8, "the covenant made with you".

[32] Cf. Annie Jaubert who thinks that the scene presents us with a renewal of the same covenant, which rests on law, Ibid., 1963, p.47.
From a different perspective, Klaus Baltzer takes both Exod 24, 19,3-8 and Deut 1-4,40 as possible examples of the knowledge in Israel of a formula, which he then applies to Exod 34, Neh 9-10, Ezra 9-10, Dan 9, and to 1QS 1,18-2,18 in an attempt to find a formula that could have been used in an act of renewal. See *Das Bundesformular*, 1960, p.48-70.

[33] Note, כרת ברית in Exod 34,10 for the divine act.
Of the new terms, not mentioned in Exod 19-24, the command to celebrate Passover in Exod 34,18 is of special interest. Of note is the proclamation, containing the reference to God as a forgiving God, God of love, cf. 34,6-7. Since these terms mark a difference compared to the promises in 19,1-6, renewal is at stake.

God, it is now only in passing. God's presence is clear from the promise, "you shall see my back; but my face shall not be seen" (33,23), the point being that to see God's face will result in death (33,20). In contrast to Exod 24 God can no longer be encountered directly. Of note is also the different climax of Exod 34, the account of Moses' return. Having encountered God passing Moses descends, unaware that his face has changed in the event.[34] Moreover, this change caused the Israelites to react with fear (34,29-35) which is best explained in terms of a relationship that has changed.[35] By affirming Moses God rebukes the people's sin instead of the expected destroying of them.[36] Thus this incident communicates not only that God is presence, holiness and power, visible as כבוד, but also that Moses has been given the role of mediator. Because Moses crossed the boundary to God, visible as a reflection of God's glory, he must be separated, not from God, but from his people and mark the distance to it by wearing a symbolic veil.[37] The veil serves primarily as a sign of God's presence among the people, just as the cloud does (40,34), secondly it protects by hiding the glory. The point is that God is present from now on in a different way, directly to Moses, mediated to the people. From the people's perspective Israel is assured of God's presence behind the veil, and from God's perspective the covenant is renewed with Israel, mediated by Moses. Thus, Exodus 33-34 is a story about a people looking back at a covenant relationship that was broken, nevertheless renewed. Essentially the story contains the idea of covenant validity. Once more covenant identity is guaranteed by God, its boundaries set by God to mark the territory to other people (34,24), and both aspects function as promises of a future identity in a land marked by its geographical boundaries. Moreover, from an overall point of view, it is essential that the distinctiveness of belonging to the covenant people of God (34,9-10) would not be known, either to the people itself or to other peoples unless God's presence is somehow visible.[38]

---

[34] Whether the Hebrew קרן means "horn" or "radiance" does not affect my interpretation. Septuagint's δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις renders the latter. So does Paul in 2 Corinthians 3, see below in Chapter Six IV (3).
Note the Greek perfect tense for the permanent result.

[35] Unlike Exod 20,18: the people was afraid of God.

[36] Cf. Benjamin Edidin Scolnic, *Jud* 40, 1991, p.578.

[37] For this interpretation, see Gerhard von Rad, *Theology*, I-II, 1975.1985, p.296: "In proportion as he (Moses) is taken over on God's side, he is separated from men". See also Dennis J. McCarthy, *Institution*, Rome 1985, p.367: "It is the otherness, the awesomeness of God which shines forth in the one who has been closest to him; not the fascination, but love."
The veil is further mentioned in 40,5.21 marking off holiness.

[38] Cf. Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.62: the definition of Israel is tied to the presence of God as the essence of the covenant.

To sum up, these three stories illustrate that although God's power is the same on all occasions, the covenant relationship changes. The change is a change of emphasis from universality to particularism, from a broad covenant with humanity to a narrow covenant that guarantees the existence of a particular people. The covenant signs function to remind God of the covenant establishments, and humanity of their validity. From the people's perspective, God is power manifest in creative actions and in covenant relationships, past or present, and therefore a special people is believed to be born. Inherent in these covenant relationships is the experience of a special presence of God, so that fundamentally the people's identity is formed and shaped on the basis of an encounter with God. Because the validity of the covenant is grounded in God's fidelity, the people's future existence rests in the hope of God's presence in a particular land provided by God, with geographical boundaries set by God. While the covenant signs in these stories serve as boundary marks because they remind of the covenant being established and maintained by God, they do not serve as obligations, nor do they serve to identify the people.

(2) Covenant Promises: Land and Posterity.

The second aspect, the promissory, is intertwined with that of divine presence. From the point of view of identity and boundaries, the promise aspect is important. From an overall perspective of a God-human relationship, the divine covenant with humans is based primarily on unconditional promises. Ultimately these promises form the basis on which both Old Testament Israel and the Christian Church build their self-understanding. Thus Israel's identity as a people is seen as God-given, which above all rests on the divine promises and God's fidelity; and when the sign of circumcision is attached, this serves primarily the purpose of being a promise, secondarily, of marking who is within the covenant. The promissory aspect is seen most clearly in the covenant traditions associated with (a) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and (b) David.[39]

(a) A Double Promise to Abraham. The theme that binds the Abraham story together in Genesis is the recurring theme of God's double promise of ארץ, land, and זרע, posterity, (12,2-3.7; 13,14-15; 15,5.7.18-21; 17,4-8; 18,18; 22,16-18). From chapter 12, when Abraham sets out, leaving his family and country (cf. 11,31), the divine blessing includes both land and descendants (cf. 12,2-3.7). Both the birth of Isaac, his escape from being sacrificed and the listing of the numerous descendants indicate that with respect to

---

[39] For Abraham, cf. Gen 17 and 22; for David, 2 Sam 7. The covenant in Gen 15 was dealt with in the previous section. The promissory aspect can also be found Gen 9, which I looked at above under (1) (a).

offspring the divine promise has been fulfilled (cf. Gen 25). The promise of land, however, is not fulfilled.[40] Rather, from an overall point of view, the promise of land is fulfilled in the Exodus story, particularly the conquest under Joshua. The double promise is repeated to Isaac in Gen 26,3-4, to Jacob in Gen 35, 9-13.[41] These promises become particularly important at the time of the Exile when the loss of land is a problem.[42] On the one hand, a hope for the return to and restitution of the land in nationalistic terms is expressed; and on the other hand, we find a universalistic perspective, that the whole world belongs to God with Zion/Jerusalem as its centre.[43] What is important when one looks at the reception of the Abraham tradition, is the point that Abraham is seen not as an individual but as a representative for Israel as a people, that therefore the promises are read as identifying the people.[44]

The double promise is repeated in the story of the so-called sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22 with an eschatological note, cf. v.15-19. This story is a sequel to the other Abraham stories, because it serves to round off the Abraham story with God's test and with Abraham's obedience and faith. As such it belongs in a context of covenant identified as promise although the term covenant does not occur in Gen 22. However, there may be a reference to the covenant idea, if the swearing in 22,16 is taken as a covenant ratification.[45] Or, there may be an intimation that covenant is related to cult, because the sacrifice probably points forward to the Paschal

---

[40] The buying of the cave of Machpelah (Gen 23) can be seen as a token (but no more) of possession of the land.

[41] The promise of land is repeated to Moses in Deut 32,52 (cf. 32,9) and 34,4. Another motif, the land as belonging to God, is found in Lev 25,23, tied to the motif that staying in the land depends on the people's obedience. Cf. M. Ottosen, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.432-36.

[42] E.g. Deut 1,36; 4,21-24.38-40; Jer 2,7; 16,18; Ezek 36,6-7.20.

[43] Cf. Hartmut Stegemann and Walther Zimmerli, in *Das Land*, 1983, p.154-71 and 33-45.

[44] This is presupposed, for instance, in the identification of God as "the God of your ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" in Exod 3,15, cf. also Exod 2,4; 6,4.
Similarly, Sir 44,19-21, including a wider scope of all nations.
Cf. also Exod 2,23-25. Here זכר is used for God, presupposing that a covenant with the people exists, cf. Ps 105,8. This point is seen by H. Eising, *TDOT* IV, 1980, p.70.

[45] This has been argued by T. Desmond Alexander, *JSOT* 25, 1983, p.17-22, in a comparison with Gen 17 and using Gen 6-9 as support.
The testing of Abraham is in order to ascertain that he fulfils the conditions laid down in 17, and when he has proved himself to be loyal to the covenant, God finally ratifies what was promised.

sacrifice.[46]

The same double promise reappears and is applied to both Isaac in Gen 26,3-5, and to Jacob in 35,9-15. Moreover, when Jacob and Isaac are mentioned in other contexts, such as Lev 26,42 (with Jacob first), Ps 105,9-10 and Sirach 44,22, they are not individuals, but types for a covenant relationship. This clearly shows that later writers grouped the patriarchs together using the covenant as a common notion for God's relationship with them all, even when not always specified in words. Not least the change of name from Jacob to Israel in Gen 32,22-32 and 35,9-15, a result of an encounter with God, is significant for identity, since it points forward to a change from "Israelites" to "Israel", from a family relationship to God's covenant people, cf. Exod 3,16.[47]

At the centre of the Abraham story Genesis 17 stands out. Here there is a reference to the eternal covenant. The significance of this is the orientation towards the future people.[48] The additional promise, "to be God to you", clearly qualifies the relationship between God and the people as a special relationship of promise.[49]

From the point of view of Jewish identity the eternal covenant with Abraham's offspring was not understood universalistically but given a nationalistic meaning. Compared with the universalistic covenant of Noah it is particularistic. By interpreting the eternal covenant as identical with an exclusive election of Jacob/Israel, covenant identity becomes ethnic.[50] However, it is important to remember that when a covenant relationship is established with Old Testament individuals as representatives of Israel, an

---

[46] This is the reception of the Genesis tradition in Jubilees. For a targumic interpretation see Robert Hayward, *JJS* 32, 1981, p.127-50.

[47] The renaming of Jacob functions as a naming of the future people, as noted by Benedikt Otzen, *Israeliterne*, 1982, p.145.
Cf. also Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.29.

[48] Gen 17,8 adds to the promise of land that it is for "a perpetual holding", using אחזה as verb.

[49] Gen 17,7 points forward to Exod 6,7; 16,12; Lev 11,45.

[50] For the view that a tension exists between a (younger) nationalistic Jacob tradition and an (older) universalistic Abraham tradition in the Rabbinic Hagadah, see Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends* 5, 1925, 1955, p.274, note 35. See also, Eugene Mihaly, *HUCA* 35, 1964, p.103-43, who interprets the tension as a Jewish claim of identity opposing a Christian accentuation of the Abraham inheritance, going back to Paul.
However, the same tension is found in The Book of Jubilees, as pointed out by John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.228-31, a point I shall return to in Chapter Two.

exclusive election is not necessarily implied.[51] Election is for a purpose, and not a privilege in itself.[52] Nevertheless, in cases where election presupposes a non-election of other parties, it becomes exclusive.[53] Conversely, covenant as an agreement with one or more parties does not necessarily exclude other relationships, nor is it opposed to other covenants.[54] In the context of the Old Testament, and especially of Genesis, the covenant with Abraham represents a narrowing down in perspective. And only if the promissory aspect is more essential than obligations, is there a universal aspect in the Abrahamic covenant.[55]

The central motif in Genesis 17 is the sign of circumcision tied to covenant establishment.[56] This motif is of particular interest in the context of boundaries. Thus "covenant", in 17,7-8, is the chief expression for the relationship God expects from Abraham. The demand for circumcision is primarily seen as the human response to the divine promise.[57] To "keep the covenant"[58] means here to accept the terms given by God. For Abraham it is the sign that to him a privilege is given; for God it is the sign that the

---

[51] For election see, Horst Seebass, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.592-608 and *TRE* 10, 1982, p.182-89; Ferdinand Dexinger, *TRE* 10, 1982, p.189-92.
Cf. the monographs, by Th.C. Vriezen, *Die Erwählung*, 1953; Otto Bächli, *Israel*, 1962; Kurt Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen*, 1928, p.37-56.

[52] Cf. Th. C. Vriezen, *Die Erwählung*, 1953, p.46: "Also ist die Erwählung, auf Personen angewendet, immer ein Beauftragen mit einer Aufgabe". And p.50: "Gott hat es erwählt, d.h. er hat Israel aus Gnade eine besondere Aufgabe erteilt, aber dies bringt keine "Zuständlichkeit", keine Wesensbestimmtheit des Volkes mit sich".

[53] Or as Jeremy Cott, *JES* 21, 1984, states, p.226: "there is a fractionalizing tendency inherent in the very idea of election". He also argues for understanding election as a problem of insecurity, thus he states, p.224: "*The belief in election is the security of the insecure; it is the denial of insecurity.* What is so striking about the belief is that it implicitly defines the problem of identity in comparative terms: certain people have a greater value or function than other people." (Author's italic.)
For a different view see, Lou H. Silberman, *EJ* 5, 1972/1974, p.498: "It (election) is the essence of the covenant, which signifies the fundamental relationship between God and Israel and is referred to throughout the entire Hebrew Bible".

[54] Cf. Masao Sekine, *ZAW* 75, 1963, p.151: "Strukturell betrachtet unterscheidet sich der Erwählungsgedanke vom Bundesgedanke insofern, als der erstere das Selbstbewusstsein des Volkes Israels unter den Völkern voraussetzt, während der letztere nur Israel und Jahwe im Auge hat".

[55] See Gen 12,3; 18,18; 22,18; 26,4; 28,14. However, the blessings should not be seen isolated from the rest of the story. That this is what Paul does in Gal 3 and 4 is a matter to which I shall return in Chapter Six.

[56] Gen 17,19.21 uses the verbal expression, הקים.

[57] For a brief and concise interpretation with further details, see Claus Westermann, *ThLZ* 101, 1976, col.161-170.

[58] שמר ברית in Gen 17,9-14 concerns the human response, while the expression appears in e.g. Deut 7,9 in reference to God and God's nature.

covenant promise is eternally valid.

Even if circumcision in Genesis 17 is not an obligation on which the covenant rests, but a sign of the covenant, it nevertheless serves to indicate that the covenant exists as promise, as well as identifying who belong to the covenant.[59] If circumcision is not practised, the covenant is broken.[60] Circumcision in itself is not sufficient as qualification for membership of the covenant, since the story specifies that God will establish the covenant with Isaac (v.19), and not with Ishmael, in spite of his qualification as both offspring and circumcised. Even if it functions as a boundary rite, it does not qualify as a symbol of entry.[61] Rather it becomes the sign that affirms the covenantal relationship without it being a condition or a means of entry.[62]

What circumcision originally stood for, whether a rite related to fertility, an apotropaic act, or a rite of initiation, is a matter of unresolved debate.[63] It may be possible to distinguish four aspects of circumcision. (1) The association with puberty and marriage indicates that circumcision was originally a fertility rite, a "rite of passage".[64] If this is the case then circumcision in Gen 17 may be interpreted as promise of posterity, functioning primarily as a reminder of the covenant promise of offspring, presupposing the idea that the covenant has a future dimension.[65] The custom to circumcise children is later and presupposes a different social context. (2) Another possible explanation is to take circumcision as a rite of perfection. Whether circumcision can actually be viewed as such in Genesis

---

[59] The function of the sign of belonging to the people of God most likely has its origin in the time of the Exile. (Most scholars therefore take Gen 17 as an exilic text.)

[60] Again there is an orientation to the future, to Exod 12,43-49 where the uncircumcised is forbidden to participate in the Passover meal, on the grounds that this is Israel's celebration.

[61] The distinction between "rite of passage" and "conversion-initiation rite" as suggested by Nicholas Taylor, *Paul*, 1992, p.100, is helpful.

[62] Against Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.28, who qualifies circumcision as "la condition nécessaire pour appartenir au peuple".

[63] See e.g. F. Stummer, *RAC* 2, 1954, col.163-64; Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.716-19; G. Mayer, *ThWAT* IV, 1984, col.734-38.

[64] This is probably the meaning of Gen 34,18-24, the circumcision of the Shechemites, and of the obscure passage in Exod 4,24-24, the circumcision of the sons of Moses. See Helmer Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966, p.203.

[65] This is convincingly argued by Michael V. Fox, *RB* 81, 1974, esp. p.586-96. Thus he suggests that P by removing the magical overtones of the old rite and by placing it in a context of covenant sign, parallel to the rainbow, makes circumcision into a cognition sign, which has the function to remind God of the divine promise of posterity. Only secondary does it identify the people.

17 is doubtful. Reception, however, shows that circumcision is understood this way, as a rite that serves to make creation complete.[66] Through this rite "man" is made equal to angels, is sanctified, and his status is changed.[67] The emphasis is on the individual's status rather than on corporate belonging. (3) There is also the aspect that circumcision stands as a cultic boundary mark. This is the case when the LXX text to Deut 30,6 is considered.[68] If the uncircumcised are identified with the impure as in Isa 52,1 and Ezek 44,7-9, circumcision is a mark of cultic purity.[69] Although the background seems to be the questioning of ethnic boundaries at the time of the exile, both these texts point to the importance of being circumcised as a condition for entering the temple, which was a requirement for as long as the temple stood. If the rite of circumcision was looked upon as necessary for a return to the land, its practice was considered a necessity in regard to maintaining the cultic purity. In this sense circumcision remains a boundary mark both until a return is made possible and as long as the cult is intact. As a consequence of this view, only the circumcised may eat the Passover meal, cf. Exod 12, 47-48.[70] (4) Circumcision finally may be seen as a symbol of renewal, as in the metaphor, "circumcision of hearts".[71] By referring to circumcision metaphorically, the Old Testament writers refer especially to the hope for a total renewal, for a transformation of humanity

---

[66] This may have an origin in an antithetical view of the sexes, so that the performance of the medical operations serve to complete the growth into full manhood and womanhood, by removing what is considered characteristic of the opposite sex. See F. Rudolf Lehmann, *Sociologus* 7, 1957, p.57-74.
The idea of completion is developed in rabbinical interpretation in which circumcision is valued due to the effect it has on the whole person. See e.g. the Mishnah, Sab 19,23; Ned 3,11 commenting on Gen 17,1 that Abraham is תמם, which may be rendered "blameless", "faultless" or "perfect". See Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.718.

[67] Cf. the reception in especially Jub 15,27, but also Jub 2,19. See below in Chapter Two II (2).

[68] Note the shift in meaning when the LXX translates Deut 30,6: *Καὶ περικαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ σπερματός σου ἀγαπᾶν κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, ἵνα ζῇς σύ.*
See Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus*, 1965, p.64-76.

[69] Circumcision in the Egyptian background seems to have been a rite for the priesthood in particular, see Erich Isaac, *Anthr* 59, 1964, p.450; F. Stummer, *RAC* 2, 1954, col.159-60.
Other explanations are, a thank-offering (cf. Lev 19,23), a sign of a dedication to God. However, there may be more than one explanation to a cultic interpretation. Cf. Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.138-139.

[70] This probably reflects an exilic self-understanding which has changed from birth related to confession related. The Passover rules serve as signs of confession, cf. Nicholas Wyatt, *SEA* 55, 1990, p.47.

[71] Cf. Deut 10,16; 30,6; Jer 4,4, cf. "uncircumcised heart" in Jer 9,26, and "new heart" in Ezek 11,19.

in the eschatological age. Because renewal is envisaged as knowledge of the law and a life practising the law in its fulness and in its intention, "circumcision of hearts" is an image for law observance. True circumcision is knowing and practising the law meticulously.[72] Since this image belongs in the context of eschatology, and is related to the hope that God's creative power will create obedience in the end time renewal, it functions as a boundary mark based on the eschatological hope.

Therefore it is no surprise that a development takes place so that circumcision is interpreted as a necessary mark of inclusion into the people of Israel, a rite by means of which national identity is maintained.[73] It then opens up the possibility of it being a rite by means of which identity is changed. However, the idea that circumcision is a boundary rite for entry is not present in Genesis 17.[74]

(b) Promises to David. A close parallel to the covenant with Abraham is the promise to David in 2 Samuel 7. This is again a narrow promise of posterity.[75] Instead of a direct encounter with God, God's promise is mediated through a prophet, who represents God, identified as the word of God. The promises, "Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever" (v.15-16), is reinterpreted in Ps 89,3-4 and 132,11-12 in covenant terms.[76] Thus it is related to the election of Zion as an eternal resting place for God in Ps 132,13-14.[77] From a holistic perspective the combination in these texts of political and cultic power under the heading of a God-given eternal covenant

---

[72] This is how renewal in the Book of Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls is interpreted, see R. le Déaut, *VT Suppl* 32, 1981, esp. p.190-98. For references to the Targum, see p.198-203.

[73] See e.g. Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.718-19,in references to Rabbinic material.
Cf. the 18th century Jewish Hasidic leader, Menahem Nahum of Chernobyl, *Upright Practises*, repr. 1982, p118: "As long as this act (circumcision) has not taken place a man may not yet be considered part of Israel".
In a religio-psychological context circumcision is seen as entry rite and may be compared to infant baptism as observed by David Flusser, *Jud* 39, 1983, p.7.

[74] Against Harold O. Forshey, *Rest Quart* 16, 1973, p.150-58.

[75] Thus the boundaries in Gen 15,8 are the same as those of the Davidic empire. Cf. G.E. Mendenhall, *IDB* I, 1962, p.718.

[76] In the story as it stands, this is God's answer to plans for building a temple for the ark on Zion (7,1-3, cf. 6,16).

[77] A close parallel is found in 1 Chr 17. The parallel to 2 Sam 7 in Ps 132 has a different emphasis, because the blessing of dynasty here depends on obedience, cf. the formula, "if"-"then" in v.12.
Apart from these texts, the tradition of a covenant with David is known also in 2 Sam 23,5; Sir 45,25, and 1 Macc 2,57.

is noteworthy.[78]

On the one hand, God is identified by acts of power, and promises tied to a future for the people in 2 Sam 7,8-10,

> "Thus says the Lord of hosts: I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep to be a prince over my people Israel; and I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies from before you; and I will make you a great name, like the names of the great ones of the earth. And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and I will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more."

Here, the references to past actions serve as God's guarantee of the validity of the present covenant with David as well as for future covenants; and thus the promises to make his name great and to appoint a place, are promises that spring directly from God's initiative. This can be seen also in v.11-12, "The Lord declares to you that the Lord will make you a house...raise up your offspring after you", and in v.13-14, "He (the offspring) shall build a house for my name...I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me".[79] The specific promises, of offspring (7,14) and of an eternal kingdom (7,16), also function as obligations laid on God by God.[80] Because "offspring" is prior to "build a house", the decisive stipulation comes from God. Not human (kingly) power, but the power of God, creates the temple; its purpose is to become a place for the presence of God in Israel.[81] And further, the writer has, by using the father-son metaphor for the future covenant relationship, not only introduced a new metaphor but also placed an emphasis on God as <u>love</u> (cf. v.15).[82] By including an unconditional promise,

---

[78] Whether 2 Sam 7 is older than and thus has influenced Ps 132, or *vice versa*, is less important. From the point of view of the reception these two traditions are interpreted as one tradition.
For the view that Ps 132 is older, see Hartmut Gese, *ZThK*, 61, 1964, and Philip Nel, in *Text and Context*, 1988.

[79] The son-motif is found also in Ps 2,7 and 89,27.
F. Charles Fensham in *Near Eastern Studies*, 1971, p.121-35, argues, against the background of Mari and Armana letters, for this to be a covenant formula. Thus, father and son refer to covenant partners, with an emphasis on God's love and fidelity.

[80] This passage contains several ambiguous statements, worthy of note is the play on "house" in the sense of both temple and dynasty, and the vague promise of offspring. In the context of the story this can either be understood as a reference pointing to the <u>immediate</u> future, to Solomon; or to a <u>distant</u> future, a dynasty.
It is unlikely that this passage contains a prophecy, pointing forward to a messianic figure, as has been suggested by Heinz Kruse, *VT* 35, 1985, p.139-64

[81] Thus, suggested by Hartmut Gese, *ZThK* 61, 1964, p.21.25.

[82] The image of the son-father relationship is not elaborated, but probably 2 Sam 7,14 contains an adoption formula, hence the relationship is one in which God promises protection and care to the king. See Helmer Ringgren,

which reminds us of the promise to Abraham, the writer of 2 Sam 7 also includes an element of covenant fulfilment.[83] Of special note is the portrait given of God as being the present and future lord of the people.

On the other hand, in 2 Sam 7, the identity of the people is described in terms of having been given a place. This promise is based on the power of God working as a warrior defending the territorial rights to a place implying that not only David but the whole people and their destiny are the object of interest.[84] The promise is tied particularly to the dynasty of David who is given a "throne established forever" (v.13), but the relationship between David and God incorporates the people of Israel (7,8, my people; 7,23 your people). Further, when the temple (7,13, cf. v.27) is mentioned, again, the incorporation of the people is implied, because the motif of the election of Zion contains the idea of Zion as centre of and for the people, temple and Zion being the locality for worshipping the presence of God in the midst of the people.[85] As the story is told, God changes David's decision on the matter of building a temple, so that promise of offspring precedes that of house; "place" is therefore both within the people set apart for God and in the temple. Thus, an important identifying factor, a temple centered worship, incorporating the cult, the sacrificial system and the priesthood,[86] has emerged. Moreover, the cultic power has been combined with the political power of the king, so that the significance of this story (God's promise of dynasty and instructions for the building of the temple) is that it contains a promise of being a people united under kingly rule. When this story is seen as God's unconditional promise to David, the promise of "a place" for the people includes a promise of a place for the worship of God (7,26).

Israelite Religion, 1966, p.225.
For the interpretation of covenant as grant, see M. Weinfeld, *JAOS* 90, 1970, p.185-203.
Apart from documentation from other Near-Eastern covenants of grants, Weinfeld stresses the promissory aspect of the grant covenant, as well as the unconditional gift for instance in relation to adoption. The grant covenant applies to both the Abrahamic and the Davidic covenant.

[83] According to G.E. Mendenhall, *IDB* I, 1962, p.718, the promise to Abraham is fulfilled and renewed in David.

[84] Cf. Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.33-34.

[85] As Hartmut Gese says, "Die Dynastieverheißung ist der politisch- religiöse Ausdruck der kultisch-religiösen Bindung Jahwes an den Zion." Cf. *ZThK*, 61, 1964, p.18.

[86] The temple with its sacrifices has an important social role to play, mainly because the major festivals of the people are temple centered, but the role of maintaining a relationship to God is also of note, cf. Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism*, 1990, p.97-105.

To sum up, the unconditional promise of posterity and land, or eternal dynasty, is the foundation for seeing identity as God-given. Without this belief, there is no unifying nationalistic factor in the covenant idea. The belief in the promises is important to Israel's special status as the people of God. The reception of the story about Abraham shows that election is interpreted as exclusion, so that those who are not born of the line of Abraham are excluded, and those who accept circumcision can be identified as belonging to the covenant by means of this sign. Both the Abrahamic and the Davidic covenant point forward to the existence of a people set apart for God, and indicate that the power of the king and the existence of a nation are based in divine promises. The idea of royal rule is ultimately subordinated to the idea of God as ruler of the people.

(3) The Obligatory Covenant of Sinai.

A significant feature in relation to both covenantal identity and boundaries, is the idea that covenant is an obligation, a law, laid upon Israel as receiver of the covenant, stressing covenant as a reciprocal relationship.[87] The tradition associates covenant and law with the figure of Moses, but it is important to note that in the texts God does not establish a covenant with Moses, but rather with the people.[88] Because the Old Testament has the giving of the law as a central idea to the covenant establishment at Sinai, an identification of law and covenant is almost inevitable.[89] This identification needs to be seen in the context of the law being the most important factor for creating the social and religious unity of the

---

[87] If the covenant stories are read sequentially, the covenants with Noah and Abraham not only precede the Mosaic covenant in time but the aspects of divine promise and validity are presupposed. There is also a sameness of quality presupposed when the writer tells the story of the Sinai covenant.

[88] In the Sinai episode, introduced in Exod 19,1-6, God relates not primarily to individuals but to the people, to the "house of Jacob" and "children of Israel" who as a result of covenant obedience shall become "God's possession out of all the peoples", and "a holy nation". Even if Moses has a special relationship and is a mediator between God and the people, the covenant partner is Israel, and the laws are aimed at the community, and subsequently the individual within that community. A central theme in the Sinai event as a whole is the future of the people and its existence within the territory promised by God. Add to this the belief that God is in a special relationship to the people, which Johs. Pedersen formulates, "a privilege for Israel" to have Yahweh as its God, cf. *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.612.

[89] For a clear identification of law and covenant, see Sir 45,3-5: "He (God) gave him commandments for his people, and revealed to him (Moses) his glory. For his faithfulness and meekness he consecrated him, choosing him out of all humankind. He allowed him to hear his voice, and led him into a dark cloud, and gave him commandments face to face, the law of life and knowledge, so that he might teach Jacob the covenant, Israel his decrees." This identification will be evident in the following chapters on Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

people. I shall briefly interpret the Sinai event, giving special attention to the obligatory aspect of the covenant.

The Sinai event is a complex narrative.[90] As the text stands, the covenant is concluded in the event recounted in Exod 19,1-24,11. First, God sets the terms, formulated in the Decalogue, to the people in Exod 20,2-17. Secondly God speaks to Moses, as mediator, in Exod 20,22-26; 21,1-23,19. After a section on God's promise of land, and on the future conquest of enemies (who are to be destroyed) in Exod 23,20-33, the covenant is finally established ritually at the foot of the mountain in Exod 24,1-14, by offering a sacrifice, reading the "book of the covenant" and sprinkling "the blood of the covenant" in front of the people, v.3-8. The story reaches a climax at the point when the seventy elders, selected to go to the top of the mountain together with Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, all see God and eat a covenant meal in the presence of God, v.9-11. Because violation of the covenant takes place, *in casu* the episode of the golden calf, the covenant terms are repeated and the covenant reestablished in Exod 34,10-28.[91] Additional laws are given, including prescriptions for the tabernacle in Exod 35-40,33. Moreover, specific laws are given throughout Leviticus, particularly 17-26, and Numbers.[92]

The main conclusion to be drawn from this story is that in the context of the Old Testament as a whole the Sinai covenant overshadows other covenant establishments both in length and reception, and in that promises and blessings are subordinate to obligations.[93] Sinai is a place associating the

---

[90] Several traditions have been worked into the one narrative in the Pentateuch. I shall make no attempt here at an explanation of the many details, or the contradictions in the narrative. From a holistic view, the narrative is an account of an event in the past that has consequences for the future, both the near future of the conquest of land, cf. Joshua, and a more distant future that may be relevant to the future reader.

[91] According to Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.44, a certain rhythm is built into the covenant concept, as a "leitmotiv" of the history of Israel: first mutual obligation, then a violation, divine anger, then repentance, forgiveness and renewal of the contract.

[92] Terms of the covenant are repeated also in Deut 5; 12-26 and 27-29 containing what looks like a formula of blessings and curses. Further in 30,1-10 we find covenant terminology in Moses' recollection of the promise of land, of blessings, phrased as "abundantly prosperous" (30,9), and in the conditions to Israel, to obey the Lord and observe the commandments, cf. also 4,25-31.
Note, that in Deuteronomy there is a stronger emphasis than in Exodus on the idea that election and covenant law constitute the relationship between God and Israel, thus particularly the laws of separation. See, Benedikt Otzen, *Israeliterne*, 1982, p.302-3.

[93] The use of כרת ברית in e.g. Exod 34,10 shows that God is subject in the establishment, and that in this traditional language we find the idea of

covenant establishment with the holiness and presence of God, and hence serves as the symbol and point of departure for all covenants between God and Israel.[94] And this raises the question, How does the obligatory covenant create a social unity which the promissory covenant does not?

The establishment of the Sinai covenant, in the context of both Exodus, 19,1-24,11; 32-34, and Deuteronomy, 27-30, must be seen as the occasion when Israel as a people comes into existence. Simultaneously, the boundaries are set and the land envisaged as the place of promise.[95] Boundaries are crossed, both in the story of crossing through the Red Sea in Exodus 14, and crossing the river Jordan in Joshua 4. These crossings are simultaneously symbolic events that point to the change of status, to liberation from slavery and entry into freedom. Moreover, Sinai is the occasion where the boundaries of the people are related to the giving of the law and the keeping of the law: God's obligation is laid on the people for the sake of the people, and limited to the people.[96] The Sinai covenant provides the rationale for the authority of the law since Exod 19,4-6 makes it clear that the Sinai event is the occasion on which God promises a special covenant relationship, conditional on obedience by the people.[97] But it is also the event that has the potential for a broken relationship, because disobedience to the covenant leads to divine wrath, punishment being the converse to blessings, both being built into the covenant. Further, the belief is expressed, that when God became visible and audible to the people, a collective relationship had begun. Through this event a particularistic alliance has been formed, an identity of Israel distinct from other nations has been created (cf. Exod 19,16-25; 20,17-26).[98] This alliance has two significant prescriptions:

God's initiative. The use of "keep the covenant", שמר ברית in e.g. Exod 19,5, points to the emphasis on covenant obligations, on terms laid on Israel, on conditions for a fulfilment of promises.

[94] Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.198.

[95] Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.476: "The country of man and the people are so closely linked that their creation coincides."

[96] Note, that already the Exodus event (cf. Exod 12-18) points forward to the birth of the people. The exodus is significant not only because it is God's act of liberation, but also because the liberation from Egypt is the basis for the covenant establishment. One more reason is that the social and religious festival, most important for the unity and identity of the people, the Passover, finds its origin in this event, and with that the hope of the existence of the people is grounded.

[97] The "if"-"then" formula clearly shows that conditions are prior to God's promise, that the people shall be God's possession.

[98] Exod 20,1-17 is a brief introductory summary of laws which presupposes the existence of the people. The first act of obedience of the people is its response to the demand for sanctification, cf. Exod 19,9-15. If this is interpreted as a ritual act, a preparation for the presence of God's holi-

worship of other gods is forbidden; associations, such as covenants with people who worship other gods, are not allowed (cf. Exod 23,32-33; 34,12-17).

These two prohibitions seem to be the core of what is contained in the covenant. All other laws are subordinate to these two. When God is not worshipped or other alliances are made, the entire existence of the people is threatened, because in the case of apostasy God's presence in blessing, necessary for the survival of the people, is no longer secured. However, the particularistic alliance between God and Israel also means that transgressions of this particular law entail extinction, since transgressions have a polluting effect on society.[99] And conversely, keeping the law has the consequence that the integrity of the community is maintained, peace is secured.[100] This is the case when the demands for ritual purity and ethical response are seen as divine obligations that the people or representatives of the people can fulfil. If the requirements are not fulfilled, then God withdraws. Israel cannot maintain its existence in the absence of God's holiness and power, since Israel as people lacks blessing and fundamental peace. The whole basis for the existence of the people, its identity as God's possession, is thus endangered when the law is not kept, the terms of the covenant not accepted.

The same principle might apply to The Law and to particular laws, because The Law creates boundaries around the people, by being a distinctive identity mark, as in the case of keeping the law of the Sabbath (e.g. Exod 31,12-18), or in the demand for sanctification (Exod 19, 9-15).[101] But while The Law thus creates and maintains a community in its distinctiveness, and particular laws serve to keep the people religiously and socially united, it may also create boundaries within the people.[102] This is seen particularly in

---

ness, it is an act by means of which the people as people enters into a state of holiness, cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.228.

[99] This idea is expressed by Johs. Pedersen, Ibid., p.426, "The law of the cult must be kept most scrupulously, for upon that depends the growth and maintenance of life. The violation of that affects the transgressor with a pollution so dangerous that it threatens the whole of the community, and therefore he must be removed." The examples given are e.g. Exod 31,14, cf. Num 15,32-35, violation of the law of Sabbath; Gen 17,14, violation of the law of circumcision; Lev 17,4, sacrifice outside sacred place and Num 9,13, not celebrating the Passover, all these transgressions entail extermination, because of the inherent attack on holiness.

[100] Ibid., also *Israel* III-IV, p.294.

[101] Parallel to circumcision in its functions as mark of covenantal belonging (cf. Gen 17,14).

[102] If the Mosaic covenant is seen as a movement of protest, the law must be understood as a positive factor for building a new society, and covenant

the case where a distinction is drawn between clean and unclean persons such as Lev 12-14. Although such laws marking the difference between groups within Israel function to preserve the integrity and identity of Israel, their reinterpretation in a context of narrow group identity becomes a particular issue in the century leading up to the time of Jesus. Eventually, they create differences within the people which will be the decisive factors for identifying who belong socially and religiously to the covenant, and who not.

From this brief explanation of the law being integral to the covenant, I conclude by referring to boundaries. "Keeping the law" defines the people as God's possession, "a holy nation" (cf. Exod 19,6: קדש גוי).[103] Consequently, holiness becomes the goal of the people, and simultaneously rules and regulations for achieving and maintaining holiness become both external boundaries that separate the "inside" people from the "outside" foreigner, and internal boundaries that divide the people into classes according to holiness.[104]

Seen from this perspective, the law serves the purpose of securing both the unity and the identity of the people, the law having a religious and a social purpose in relation to covenantal boundaries. The people's identity is affected in so far as it has geographical boundaries.[105] The theme, promise of land, central to the Abrahamic covenant, is in the context of the Sinai covenant, cf. Exodus 19,6, not only tied to being a holy nation, but now also dependent on keeping the law, cf. Exod 23,23-33; 34,10-26 and Deut 7.[106]

---

thus, with a different perspective, is a social alliance in which a people's allegiance to its God is fundamental. For this view, see Walter Brueggemann in *The Bible*, 1983, esp. p.312: "Human society, as ordered by Moses, is covenantal because the covenant God both sanctions and expects it. And Israel must resist every religion and every politics which would dismantle the covenant."

[103] For holiness, see Helmer Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966, p.74-75. Holiness in a human context is according to Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.264, originally a principle, "power" and "strength", and it lies "at the root of all other kinds of energy".

[104] The hierarchy of holiness is based on the idea that the centre is more holy than the periphery, which the prescriptions for the building of the desert sanctuary illustrate, Exod 36-40, cf. the temple wall in Ezek 42,20. It follows from this that there is also a hierarchy of holiness among the people according to class, high-priest, priest, and lay. See Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.280-83.

[105] The promise of land for possession is tied to the purpose of leaving Egypt, cf. Exod 3,8 and 12,25, but is also the hope for a future.

[106] Not only does entry to the land depend on keeping the law, but so do blessings, peace, life, both for the individual and for the people. Thus, both the geographical limits and the existence of the people presuppose the keeping of the law.

Thus, when the land is finally conquered, a covenant is established at Shechem this is marked in order to reassure the establishment of law and order for the people (cf. Joshua 24,25). The people's identity and boundaries are affected in so far as it has laws as to who has a right to belong and who not. The elaborate social, ethical and cultic obligations (Exod 20-24) are revealed to and demanded of the people by divine decree and serve as unifying elements. When these laws are not kept, exclusion is the result.[107] It is also notable that social care and mutual love are grounded in divine demands, not as universal rules but as specific demands for the people's identity.[108] Thus "love your neighbour" (Lev 19,18) is in an Old Testament context a rule related to national solidarity, not to be applied outside peoples, to enemies.[109] On the other hand, in the laws requiring care for the weak and marginal, e.g. Exod 22,21-29, there is a rudimentary idea of inclusiveness.[110]

In sum, the obligatory aspect contains primarily the idea that identity is based on God-given conditions as the most central aspect of the covenant. In contrast to the emphasis on God's promises in the stories about Noah, Abraham and David, the story of the Sinai covenant emphasises obligations and sanctions; blessings and promises result from obedience. Keeping the law should first of all be seen as a social factor identifying who belong to the community. Israel's existence is based on the idea that divine obligations mark the people's identity and boundaries.

(4) Broken and Restored Covenant Relationship.

Although the divine word of promise has in view an eternal covenant, time and again Israel breaks the covenant for various reasons. Therefore a reestablishment of the covenant relationship becomes a necessity, which is expressed either as the hope for renewal, that God will give (1) a "new covenant", (2) a "new spirit" and "new heart", (3) a "new song" to praise God, (4) create "new things" or (5) give a "new name", all of which are eschatological hopes that affirm a belief in the divine promises.[111] Or the

---

[107] See e.g. Exod 21,12, punishment for murder is deportation or death.

[108] I owe to Walter Brueggemann, *The Bible*, 1983, the point of social care in what he calls the "trajectory of the Mosaic liberation" with its focus on justice and freedom, see esp. p.312.
See also Arland J. Hultgren, *LuthQ* 28, 1976, esp. p.34-35.

[109] See Helmer Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, 1966, p.134.

[110] Thus Jeremy Cott, *JES* 21, 1984, p.206-7, who calls the theology of the stranger "the exact opposite of the idea of election", p.207.

[111] The clearest examples of these hopes are: (1) Jer 31,31, (2) Ezek 18,31 (cf. 11,19-20; 36,26), (3) Ps 40,4 (MT) and Isa 42,10, (4) Isa 43,19; 48,6 and (5) Isa 62,2.4.

hope in the exile situation projects a concrete return to the land of promise, or is expressed as Israel's return to God's covenant, to accept its ritual and ethical laws. Restoration is called for at moments of crisis, times of change for the people. It may be in the form of going through a ceremony of atonement reaching towards God, or a ritual symbolising that God is reaching out to reaffirm God's relationship with humanity. In this survey of the Old Testament covenant it is impossible to treat every aspect of broken covenant and hope for restoration. Consequently, I shall draw on a few texts that are of particular importance for the theology of newness, and look at (a) one of the historical books, and (b) the prophetic writings.

(a) Covenant Restoration in The Pentateuch. When illustrating the issue of a broken and reestablished covenant the story of the covenant with Phinehas in Num 25,6-13 is important.[112] Apparently an insignificant episode, covered as it is in but a few verses, it is nevertheless of considerable interest as the reception of it shows.[113] Why is this story important? And what is the significance from the point of view of covenantal identity and boundaries?

In Num 25 Phinehas kills an Israelite and a foreign woman, seemingly for fornication, so that he is characterized as a guardian of identity, threatened when Israelites practise intermarriage. Simultaneously, a more serious offence, worship of and sacrifice to foreign gods, is identified.[114] As the story is told, boundaries have been violated. The obligation of the Sinaitic covenant demanding exclusive worship of Yahweh is set aside.[115] When the just anger of God nearly destroys the people, Phinehas averts this by an

---

For "newness" see, R. North, *TDOT* IV, 1980, p.225-44; Aage Bentzen, *StTh* 1, 1948, p.183-87.

[112] Although the theme of renewal is presented already in Exodus 33-34, and the idea is found in a number of contexts reflecting a historical crisis or a major change, of which Joshua is a typical example, chapter 24 in particular, I shall limit myself to Num 25.
The covenant of Ezra in Nehemiah 9-10 could be included, but is different because it is concluded between the leaders of Jerusalem.

[113] For a study on the role of Phinehas, see William Klassen, *SBL Papers 1986*, p.490-500.
The most relevant texts are Joshua 22,10-34; Ps 106,30-31, Sir 45,23-24; 1 Macc 2,26.54. To this may be added references to Phinehas in Josephus, Philo, Pseudo-Philo and Rabbinic literature.

[114] Cf. Num 25,2. The whole passage is obviously redacted, but it matters less in this context whether the various levels are from different stories. From a holistic perspective the message is clear enough.

[115] Cf. Exod 20,5. See above in II (3).

act of "atonement".[116] As a result God makes a covenant with him.[117] The content of this is a promise of eternal priesthood, identified as a covenant of peace (Num 25,12-13). Since it is difficult from the context to find a precise meaning for "covenant of peace" I shall concentrate on what the promise of perpetual priesthood means in relation to my topic.[118]

This story about Phinehas is relevant in a context of boundaries and identity for two reasons. On the one hand, it ties covenant to the special status of the priesthood. Covenant is then used not of the relationship between God and people in general, but in a particularistic sense, of covenant with a class.[119] Thus, covenant becomes limited to priesthood, whose authority is now based on the promise of an eternal covenant. To a certain degree, this is parallel to the exclusive covenant with David and the election of a kingly dynasty.[120] It is noteworthy that the election of the line of Phinehas, over against Levites in general and other lines in particular, creates boundaries within the priests as a class.[121] On the other hand, the story ties a broken covenant to atonement.[122] Thus, through a human act of reconciliation the relationship with God is reestablished when God accepts Phinehas' atonement as an act of reconciliation which simultaneously contains the element of human revenge. When God promises the covenant as a reward for the atoning act of Phinehas, this stands out as an exclusive election to priestly service. Note, the potential in both these aspects for interpreting covenant as an exclusive election.

---

[116] Num 25,9 mentions the death of 24.000, a destruction that ends when Phinehas "made atonement for the Israelites" (v.13). The Hebrew term is כפר with Phinehas as subject.

[117] Num 25,12, has נתן בריתי, as in Gen 9,12; 17,2.

[118] The "covenant of peace" may have been influenced by Mal 2,5-9 where covenant of life and peace is tied to Levitical priesthood and to interpretation of the law. But Mal 2,1-4 also ties covenant to disobedience and punishment. For a discussion of Phinehas in Rabbinic traditions I refer to Robert Hayward, *JJS* 29, 1978, p.22-34.

[119] This is a line of thought that is taken over in CD and 1QS, as we shall see in Chapters Three and Four below.

[120] See above in II (2) (c).

[121] An alleged rivalry between the two priests Zadok and Abiathar, respectively in line of Eleazar and Ithamar, sons of Aaron, is behind e.g. 1 King 2,26-27; 1 Chron 15,14-15; 24,3-6. By giving a special status to Phinehas, of the line of the Zadokites according (cf. 1 Chron 24,1-6) the redactor of Num 25 makes election of Phinehas stand for superiority. Cf. also Ezek 40,46; 43,19; 44,15 and Sir 45,23-24.

[122] Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.363, gives the following explanation to the atoning and purifying act of Phinehas: "Atonement is here effected by extirpating the root of the evil in the same way as a murder is expiated by putting to death the perpetrator."

If covenant is limited to priesthood, boundaries are limited accordingly, since these are defined according to unacceptable behaviour. In subsequent perspective Phinehas is a model for righteous zeal, a priestly judge; and his atonement is seen as an act of purification, a life-giving act for the people.[123] Apart from being used to emphasise the atoning function, the story may be used to give authority to other priestly functions, since it gives a number of commissions: to interpret the law, to judge and act accordingly; hence it gives jurisdiction to the priestly rule as well as to the cult. The reception shows that this story was used as scriptural foundation by some groups, while other groups, as for instance those behind the New Testament, chose to disregard, or even reject, this particular covenant tradition because it reflects a covenant ideology that is not acceptable.[124]

(b) Renewal in the Prophetic Writings. In the preexilic prophets covenant is a rare term, and not before Jeremiah is the covenant a phenomenon of any significance.[125] Close to the same background is the exilic prophet, Ezekiel. What they have in common is the reference to a broken covenant and a hope for renewal. What Jeremiah expects is a "new covenant", and what Ezekiel hopes for is a "new heart" and a "new spirit". Both look to a future new condition for relationship with God, created by God. From an overall point of view I shall ask, What kind of covenant relationship is envisaged? What relationship is there between "new" and the already existing covenant? And what kind of self-understandings are reflected in these prophecies of renewal?

First, "new covenant" in Jeremiah.[126] It is noteworthy that the phrase "new covenant" only occurs once in all Old Testament writings, therefore it cannot be classified as a typical phrase, and should be treated with caution as the exception it is. What then is the nature of this "new" covenant in

---

[123] Thus concluded by William Klassen, *SBL Papers 1986*, p.499-500.

[124] For William Klassen, ibid., p.499, Phinehas is a rejected model, because of the theology of atonement: atonement takes place by virtue of killing an offender. Over against Phinehas' role which involves the act of killing, the New Testament sets the role of Jesus; moreover, he points to the New Testament interpretation of suffering, which involves accepting rather than "inflicting suffering".

[125] I shall here especially look at "new covenant" from Jer 31,31-34 and "new heart and new spirit" from Ezek 11,19-20; 36-37.
Deuteronomy, especially chapter 30,1-10, belongs to the same category according to its content, but I shall refer to the this only in passing. Its focus on covenant as expression of love which calls for human law obedience is worth having in mind. See Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.90-94; 255-57; Otto Bächli, *Israel*, 1962, passim.

[126] Thus Jer 31,31: ברית חדשה, of a covenant God will establish with the people, "the house of Israel and the house of Judah".

Jeremiah? Does "new" signal a different covenant idea than elsewhere in the Old Testament?

Jeremiah's frequent use of the covenant term (without "new") should be understood against the background of a consciousness that past covenants have been given by God.[127] From the use of the formula, "I will be your God and you shall be my people", it is clear that covenant is a relationship between God and Israel, within history, in past, present and future, not a timeless principle.[128] Because the divine covenant promise is in a context of a people, this means, in an exile situation, a hope of returning to the land.[129] Jeremiah's re-use of this formula presupposes that he believes God is the same God in former as well as in all relationships.[130]

Jeremiah's vision of a "new covenant" has an antecedent in a "broken covenant".[131] Since the covenant has been broken through Israel's sin and apostasy, Israel has experienced the loss of the land; the implication of this is that the existence of the people is threatened, that therefore covenantal identity may be lost.[132] This is actually expressed in the Septuagint text which contains a sentence that is not in the MT. Thus LXX 31,32 reads, after "not like the covenant I made with their ancestors, when I took them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt", "for they did not continue (abide) in my covenant and I had no concern for them, says the Lord," ὅτι αὐτοι οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, φησὶ Κύριος. This means that the covenant is not just broken, rather that it is no longer valid. In the Hebrew version Jeremiah's hope for a new covenant is not over against an invalid covenant, but over against a covenant that was broken by Israel being faithless. A clarification of the meaning of "new" is therefore vital.[133] I see four important motifs in this vision of

---

[127] 21 occurrences: Jer 3,16; 11,2.3.6.8.10; 14,21; 22,9; 31,31.32.33; 32,40; 33,20.21.25; 34,8.10.13.15.18; 50,5.

[128] Cf. 7,23; 11,4 where it is used of the past covenant, the Sinai covenant, and Jer 24,7; 30,22; 31,1; 31,33; 32,38 used of a future relationship. In 34,13 we find "covenant with ancestors", ברית את־אבותיכם, which is parallel to ברית ראשנים in CD 1,4; 6,2 and ברית האבות in CD 8,18; 19,31. The future covenant of 31,32 is "not like the covenant...with their ancestors" (אבותם).

[129] See e.g. Jer 11,3-5, cf 12,7-13.

[130] For this, see Knud Jeppesen in *Judendom*, 1986, p.70-71.

[131] Cf. Jer 11,10; 31,32.

[132] The motif of loss of land is present but not a dominant theme; but see Jer 32,23-25.

[133] Jer 31,32 explicitly says, that the new will not be like the one they broke, which does not question God's faithfulness. Cf. Jer 3,12-14 where Israel's apostasy is related to the broken covenant.

renewal.

First, the new covenant Jeremiah expects is one that will be established by God in the future, within the framework of history, which is clear from the identification of covenant and liberation from Egypt (31,32).[134] If the frame is history, not something beyond it, this implies that "new" is in a context of the return of the people; hence that new covenant reestablishes the identity of the people. This means that covenantal identity is in terms of a recreated Exodus people,[135] and "new" consequently reflects a circular, not a progressive relationship.[136]

Secondly, the recipient of the covenant is the people, the house of Israel and the house of Judah (31,31). Thus, the partners of the relationship are the same as in previous establishments, God and the people.[137] Because there is no doubt that covenant has the people as partner, rather than an individual representative, Jeremiah maintains the idea of a covenant as a category of identity for the people.

Thirdly, covenant and "torah" are, if not identical, at least closely associated.[138] The content of the covenant is the same inasmuch as it is still a covenant of law, neither a different law, nor a new law. By means of the motif of law, Jeremiah can not only relate the new covenant of the future to the past broken covenant, but also create a consciousness of identity in the present situation.

Fourthly, there is a vision of God reaching out to the people in a creative

---

[134] Jer 31,31 and 33 use the verbal expression כרת denoting that God is subject for the act of establishment.
The future that the prophet refers to is historical time, not beyond history, cf. Knud Jeppesen, in *Judendom*, 1986, p.69.
Cf. Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism*, 1990, p.194: The prophets expect the eschatological events to take place as "a turning-point"; judgment and restoration herald a new beginning of history.

[135] Obedience, expressed in the phrase "hear my voice", cf, Jer 7,22-23, may refer to the renewal of the Sinai covenant. See Christoph Levin, *Die Verheissung*, 1985, p.81.89.

[136] For this observation, which can be illustrated from the pattern of the return of seasons, or phases of the moon, see Christoph Levin, Ibid., p.140.

[137] This has been stressed by Robert P. Carroll, *From Chaos*, 1981, p.221. In spite of his interpretation that covenant is internalised, he rightly maintains that this does not imply that the covenant is not collective. Further, Christoph Levin, Ibid., p.146.

[138] For emphasising that the content is a command to obedience, see already J.J.P. Valeton, *ZAW* 13, 1893, p.248, M. Weinfeld, *ThWAT* I, col.807, and H.-J. Hermisson in *Altes Testament*, 1983, p.231.

act to change their "hearts".[139] Since it is not an external law, "set before" the Israelites (Jer 26,4), but an internal knowledge both of belonging to God (v.33b), and of the divine will, the metaphor of writing on hearts ultimately refers to obedience, as possible without knowledge of an external law.[140] In the promise, that in the future God will "put the law within them", and "write it on their hearts" (v.33), lies the key to the understanding of the new covenant.

Two things may be implied. a) By divine act sin is made impossible, because breaking the law will not be a possibility in future.[141] b) What is "new" is the way the law is being transmitted.[142] By proclaiming that sin will no longer be remembered, Jeremiah maintains that God's forgiveness is not an effect, rather the grounds on which the (new) covenant rests.[143] Assuming that the new relationship is to "know" and "fear" God, he states that sin will no longer be subject to punishment.[144]

Because the law is envisaged as an internal law,[145] rather than an external law,[146] and because the law will be given to the people as such, inasmuch as

---

[139] "Heart" symbolises the person, the totality, see Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.172, and more recently, H. J. Fabry, *ThWAT* IV, 1984, p.413-51.
See also Christoph Levin, Ibid., p.259-60, who, in reference to H.W. Wolf, *Dodekapropheton I. Hosea*, BK.AT XIV 1, 1965, argues that this metaphor refers to the totality of the torah, and sees the promise as a promise of a total conversion (Umkehr).

[140] For the point that Jeremiah attacks the priestly authority whose task it is to teach the law, and thereby he attacks the power of the law in the hands of the priest, as in Deut 6,5-9, see Troels Engberg-Pedersen, in *Det gamle Testamente*, 1988, p.92-95.

[141] Cf. the parallel expression in Jer 32,38-40, what is created is "one heart and one way that they may fear me for all time".
Cf. Ernst Kutsch, *TRE* 7, 1981, p.400, who states that if the law can be obeyed (Jer 31,34) as a divine gift, then sin is no longer possible.

[142] Cf H.-J. Hermisson, in *Altes Testament*, 1983, p.231: The way and the manner (Art und Weise) in which God communicates the law is new, not the content.

[143] According to the content of the promise, the sins to be forgiven can only be past sins, therefore forgiveness is not an effect but the foundation for a changed relationship.
For the point that v.34 "their sin" means the sins of past, see Knud Jeppesen, in *Judendom*, 1986, p.75. For the point that the unconditional forgiveness is unparalleled, see Christoph Levin, Ibid., p.134.

[144] Parallel to the covenant with Noah, and God's promise "not to destroy" humanity, in Gen 8,21; 9,11.

[145] This was observed already by Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.68.

[146] For the use of internalization of the law see Robert P. Carroll, *From Chaos*, 1981, p.223-25.
Internalization may be chosen as a criticism of a system or an authority that has become rigorous and inflexible in attitude and approach.

it will be written on their hearts, the foundation for (the new) covenant relationship will also be different. What is different when Jeremiah presupposes that God will "remember sin no more", is that God's motivation for establishing a covenant of relationship is forgiveness.[147] And thus, the new covenant, by being unconditional, and not dependent on external signs, obedience or acceptance, points forward to a future, different relationship between God and God's people, a relationship envisaged in terms of the people's future knowledge of who God is.

The reception in the New Testament clearly shows that Jeremiah's description of newness has the potential for furnishing new values to both identity and boundaries, to restore covenant in its capacity of being unconditional promise. From the perspective of covenantal boundaries, the given interpretation makes it clear that "covenantal nomism" with its tendency to focus on law in its function as identifying factor is a less satisfactory category. Based on Jeremiah, I conclude that covenantal boundaries are both the traditional territorial boundaries (30,4) and the religious boundaries of "God's people" (31,33). But because the "new" covenant may be identified as God's forgiveness, boundaries will need to be redefined accordingly. For Jeremiah this means that boundaries are, by being related to fear and knowledge of God, internalised. If identity is based on knowledge of God, then boundaries cannot express who belongs to a covenant of salvation or non-salvation, because covenant is rather a category for relationship with God as a God of presence, and not a term of exclusiveness.[148] Here lies the potential for a change in the definition of boundaries, from national or ethnic to internal boundaries related to forgiveness.

However, the reception in the New Testament, with its focus on forgiveness and messianic fulfilment, is not the only way to read Jeremiah. If the context of 30,3-31,34 is taken seriously, Jeremiah's promise is primarily a promise to "return to the land", to become a people who can resume life in the land and under the law of the land. From the point of view of history, this promise has already been fulfilled in the experience of the return from the exile.[149] It is against this background that the intertestamental writers read Jeremiah, and some groups, or communities, see it as their purpose to

---

[147] Note the use of the verb זכר, in the same positive sense as in Gen 9,15-16. See above in II (1) (b).

[148] If the exile is taken seriously as a context, then the promise of a new relationship must be understood in a context of this experience of punishment and/or absence of God. A similar hope for renewal is expressed in Deutoro-Isaiah, in terms of transformation. See e.g. Isa 42,24-25; 43,1-7; 43,15-21; 48,1-11.

[149] Cf. Norbert Lohfink, *Bund*, 1989, p.66-67.

study the law and keep it meticulously. Because they see covenant from a perspective of keeping the law, they therefore take it to be a human obligation to change the heart.

Secondly, covenant and newness in Ezekiel. Like Jeremiah, Ezekiel understands covenant as a relationship broken through sin and transgression.[150] The hope for renewal is tied to the language of conversion/repentance; hence the expressions, "a new heart and a new spirit" (Ezek 18,30-31, 36,26-28, cf. also 11,19-20).[151] This takes renewal a step further than Jeremiah, in the direction of individualisation.[152] Since these expressions belong in a context of hope for a new relationship on different conditions, the theology of newness applies. Thus, God is expected to restore the relationship by giving the "covenant of peace" and/or "an eternal covenant".[153] Such different conditions of relationship are also hoped for in the context of the Pentateuch, where Deuteronomy's "circumcision of heart" stands for the hope of a radical renewal initiated by God.[154] The key question is, what is the nature of the renewed, restored relationship?

The "covenant of peace" and the "eternal covenant" are clearly future covenants, thought of as a relationship between God and the people.[155] Thus, the formula, "I will be their God and they shall be my people"[156] indicates that the covenant builds on a reciprocal relationship and that God's care for the people is the foundation for its future existence.[157] The hope, expressed in

---

[150] For covenant see Ezek 16,8.60.61.62; 17,13.14.15.18.19; 20,37 30,5; 34,25; 37,26; 44,7.
The broken covenant, see especially Ezek 16,59; 17,16; cf. 37,23.

[151] Thus Ezek 36,26 has the prophecy of a "new heart" and a "new spirit", the replacement of the "heart of stone" with a "heart of flesh" (or "human"), which presupposes Jeremiah's heart metaphor; it is different inasmuch as there is a distinction between two qualities of heart; common for both is the motif of law related to the identity of the people. These ideas are presupposed in 2 Corinthians 3, see Chapter Six IV.

[152] Already noted by Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.70: Although Israel as people is rebuked for breaking the covenant, the future restoration is in individual, personal terms.

[153] Thus Ezek 37,26, וכרתי להם ברית שלום ברית עולם, cf. also 16,60; 34,25. In Jeremiah "eternal" is associated with judgment, as in Jer 17,4; 18,16; 20,11; 23,40; 33,11; 49,33, with covenant in 32,40; 50,5, cf. also 33,20-26. For "eternal" see H.D. Preuss, *ThWAT* V, 1986, col.1144-1159.

[154] Deut 30,1-10, is probably the origin to the idea of "spiritual circumcision" which is not to replace circumcision of flesh. Rather it adds a spiritual dimension, making the whole person object for perfection.

[155] Close to Jeremiah's idea, cf. Knud Jeppesen, *Judendom*, 1986, p.78.

[156] Cf. Ezek 11,20; 14,11; 36,28; 37,32.27.

[157] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.71, has made the important observation that Ezekiel never uses "covenant" of the past relationship between God and

an exilic situation, is for a return to the land.[158] The territorial rights and boundaries refer to past promises, but the future dimension is also strong. The existence of the land presupposes geographical boundaries. This is also behind the vision of the new temple as a concrete place in the land symbolising the presence of God with the people.

The renewed relationship is expected to be a radical purification. Thus, in the metaphor, "a new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you: and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh" (36,26), a radical change is expected to be wrought by God. On the one hand, this builds on Jer 31,31-33, the writing of the law within the hearts; on the other hand, the Ezekiel passage is less centered on the law, because by adding "new spirit", newness means that a different human nature is being created, so that personal, inner renewal is in the foreground. The purpose of this is to ensure that the people "know" God (37,14), who in return will be present "among them forever" (37,26). In short, because renewal is envisaged as a radical change, not just of covenant but of relationship in general, it refers to a different quality of life. The presence of God's spirit of life (36,26; 37,14) then becomes a mark of identification, drawing the boundary between those who belong to God and those who do not.

In sum, a hope of renewal of the covenant presupposes either a broken relationship, caused by sin or apostasy, or a situation in which the covenant has been declared invalid. The hope concerns the people and its future existence, its relation to God, its ability to be faithful to God. The change hoped for is a radical change expressed in the vocabulary of God giving "new" heart, "new" spirit, "new" covenant. The prophets point forward to a different interpretation of relationship with God, and as we shall see, it takes one form when received in the Dead Sea Scrolls and another in Paul, depending on the prevalent idea of newness.

III. Conclusion.

The most important point to notice concerning covenantal identity and boundaries in the Old Testament is the variety of aspects, tied together in

---

people.

[158] Thus Ezek 20,6.15, where the divine promise is referred to in terminology of swearing an oath. 20,34-38 prophecies a new entry to the land of promise, tied to judgment and purification. The cultic overtones of holiness are significant in several ways, cf chapters 40,1-48,35, because the validity of the cult is thus not questioned; rather, when tied into the hope for renewal, cult by implication continues to be important for the individual. For the land issue, see Walther Zimmerli in *Das Land*, 1983, p.39-42.

an interdependent relationship. As agreement the covenant is never a term for a mere vertical relationship between the individual and God. There is always a horizontal, a social/political dimension, since the blessings, the promise of land, dynasty, and descendants concern the existence of the nation and the future of God's people. Since the Old Testament covenant is a complex idea it may be expressed in the four aspects suggested. My study of texts shows that there is basically one covenant established by God, although from a human viewpoint there are several covenants, given at different times with various individuals or with representatives of the people. Further, it is of note that concrete covenants are visible in symbols, which function as guarantees for their eternal validity. The presence of God is not just a momentary experience of a divine theophany; rather it is experienced as a reality in past, present and future as something that points to the eternalness of the covenant. Blessing and curse, obedience and disobedience are interdependent, either obedience being the condition for blessings, or blessings being unconditional yet calling for a response. Experiences of a broken covenant and law are interpreted in judgment categories, but with this as a base, they also give rise to hopes of renewal, of a new and different covenant, of a radical change introduced by divine intervention.

Even if it is not possible to draw on the Old Testament for a uniform idea of the covenant, there is one term that is associated with both the individual established covenants such as the Sinai covenant, and with the renewed covenant; and that is "eternal". With this term the theological aspect of divine promise and validity is emphasised. Since "eternal" is also future orientated, eschatology is also suggested. This meaning will be more evident when we turn to the intertestamental writers and to Paul.

From the point of view of identity, covenantal belonging can be characterized in the following way:

1. Identity as relationship is God-given; boundaries for relationships are based on God's guarantee.
2. Identity of the people is grounded in God's calling the people into existence; establishing the covenant with Israel is such a basis.
3. Covenantal identity cannot be separated from God's blessing and promises, nor from covenantal obligations.
4. Covenantal boundaries, when related to ethnic identity, are geographical boundaries that mark territory; when identity is interpreted religiously, boundaries mark belonging to God, are ritual or symbolic by nature; they mark the distance to God's holiness and as concrete marks they belong to social identity.

PART B

PALESTINIAN JUDAISM:

COVENANTAL IDENTITY AND ECCLESIOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES.

In my first chapter I focused on the covenant and its ritual boundaries in the Old Testament. I concluded that the Old Testament acknowledges one covenant as an expression of relationship between God and ethnic Israel. This one covenant find a manifestation in separate covenant events, in which an encounter with God takes place at important points in history. Because the covenant is established on God's initiative, it has eternal validity, and is expected to last into the future and secure the existence of Israel. The covenant relationship is envisaged as a universalistic covenant with humanity, or as a particularistic covenant with Israel or even part of Israel. Boundaries are interpreted in wide categories and marked according to geographical, ritual or legal borderlines reflecting an ethnic covenantal self-understanding.

In this part B, Chapters Two to Four, I move to the intertestamental literature with the aim of demonstrating the existence of a pattern of interdependence between identity and boundaries against the Old Testament background and in Chapter Five I shall look briefly at John the Baptist as a representative of a transitional period.

When I turn to the Dead Sea Scrolls, I shall look first at the Temple Scroll (11QTemple) along with the Damascus Document (CD) and secondly deal with the Rule of the Community (1QS).[1] As a rule I prefer the expression "Dead Sea Scrolls" as overall term, rather than "Qumran literature",[2] since this expression does not assume that these writings, found in the caves at Qumran, all necessarily reflect one and the same Qumran community.[3] When approaching the Dead Sea Scrolls, a fundamental question is, Is there a

---

[1] Other relevant texts to which I shall refer in passing are: The Messianic Rule (1QSa), The Hodayot (1QH), and The War Scroll (1QM).
All these texts have been studied in Hebrew and in a selection of modern translations. For the range of editions and translations I refer to my bibliography, part I.

[2] Scholarly consensus is that the archaeological findings of the Qumran site are evidence for the existence of an Essene community here, "the Qumran community". Most scholars see this reflected in the literature found in the nearby caves, hence the term "Qumran literature". This consensus has been questioned by Normam Golb, *JNES* 49, 1990, p.103-114, who believes the site was used as a military camp, not by a religious community.
For a succinct criticism of an unreflected use of "Qumran", "Qumran community" and "Essene", see Philip R. Davies, *RdQ* 14, 1990, p.503-19, esp. p.503-8.

[3] Particularly since the publication of 11QTemple, the widely accepted hypothesis that all Dead Sea manuscripts have an origin in "the Qumran community", has been challenged. Thus it may be argued that not all manuscripts found in the Qumran caves contain ideas that are representative of one group, so that these writings could reflect either different groups or one or more stages of a group's development, or both. Historical studies,

unanimously agreed interpretation of the covenant and what it entails? The mere fact that these writings vary in character, genre and theological content raises the possibility that they belong to different strands of Judaism in antiquity. Therefore a fresh look is needed to clarify whether or not there is disagreement (within a group, or among different groups) over the understanding of the covenant. Following from this there are questions to be asked, such as, where boundaries lie, what they are and whom they concern. Such differences could be attributable to developments over the course of time or to diverse theologies, and interpretations of the scriptural basis for self-understanding. I shall approach these texts with this in mind, assume each text is a witness in its own right, and proceed by asking in general terms, How is the covenant concept used, reused and interpreted? Is there continuity with the horizontal and vertical relationship known from the Old Testament and the Book of Jubilees? Is there a change? Does "covenant" express a universalistic or a particularistic relationship to God? How is covenant belonging reflected in boundary rites? Are these rites of affirmation? Or rites of entry? Are the boundaries around the people, within it, or both?

Since the Book of Jubilees clearly focuses on covenant as a category for communal identity and stresses the importance of circumcision, it is natural to start my analysis here. Moreover, its interpretation of the Old Testament covenantal ideas makes it a good literary example of a theology that has consequences for social boundaries.

---

based on archaeology, palaeography and ancient accounts of the Essenes and on the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, can only conclude that the community that is behind one or more of the writings may have been an Essene group. To attempt more is less than safe.
For a reconstruction of the history of the Qumran community and a balanced view of the given evidence, see Phillip R. Callaway, *History*, 1988.
For a wider and general political and religious background see George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 1981 p.101-60, and especially Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism*, 1990.
For resent reseach reviews, see Adam S. van der Woude, *ThR* 54, 1990, p.221-61; 55, p.243-307; 57, p.1-58. 225-53.

CHAPTER TWO.

COVENANT CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.

My overall concern here in Chapter Two will be whether covenant consciousness in the Book of Jubilees is conceived in continuity with the Old Testament covenant and whether this has consequences for how Jubilees defines its boundaries.

I have chosen the Book of Jubilees as an important example of Palestinian Jewish writing.[1] Even if it is generally accepted that the author of Jubilees alludes to contemporary conflicts, it is an unsettled matter whether the crisis referred to is the situation under Antiochus IV (175-64 BC) or the Maccabean/Hasmonean conflict (160-150 BC).[2] In the latter case Jub 34,2-9 and 37,1-38,14, referring to the war between the seven Amorite kings and Esau and his sons, are read as references to the Maccabean conflict. There is, however, no absolute certainty that this is a correct interpretation.[3] As for the possibility that there are allusions to the situation under Antiochus IV, the most important evidence is taken from (a) Jub 15,33-34's attack on uncircumcision; (b) Jub 20,4; 22,20; 25,1; 27,10 and 30,1-15 against intermarriage; (c) Jub 20,7-9 and 22,16-18 on idolatry (d) Jub 2,25-27; 50,8.12-13 on keeping the Sabbath and (e) Jub 6,17-36; 16,20-31; 24,18-19.40 with the demand to celebrate the festivals.[4] However,

---

[1] The Book of Jubilees has been studied in the following translations, Danish, English and German. My bibliography, part I.
Unless otherwise stated my quotations are from "Jubilees" by C. Rabin, in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, (Ed. H.F.D. Sparks), 1984, p.1-139.
For translation with comments cf. Bent Noack (hereafter abbreviated as Jubilæerbogen); Klaus Berger; O.S. Wintermute; James C. VanderKam.
Since the discovery of Hebrew fragments of Jubilees at the Qumran site, it is generally accepted that the place of origin is Palestine.

[2] There is a lack of scholarly consensus on how to date Jubilees. Thus it is debated whether Jubilees reflects the political situation under Antiochus IV, 167/65 BC (cf. Nickelsburg and Schwarz), or the Maccabean period of Judas, 166-60 BC (cf. Davenport), or the conflict with the rise of Jonathan as high-priest (160/59-150/49 BC (cf. VanderKam), or the death of Ptolemy VI Philometor, 145 BC (cf. Berger), or the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus, if Jub 30 refers to Samaria being conquered, or after 128 BC (cf. Noack).
My question on identity and boundaries are relevant even when the more specific questions on date and political situation cannot be definitively answered.

[3] See George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 1981, p.78-79.

[4] See especially the detailed study of separation and its relation to the question of identity by Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität*, 1982, p.103-11. By studying the history of the idea of separation, its relation to socio-religious behaviour, its scriptural background, he argues for the reign of Antiochus IV, 167-65 BC, as the setting of Jubilees. However, this is not quite convincing.
Also George W.E. Nickelsburg, Ibid., p.78-79.

these texts with their fear of foreign cultural influence cannot be limited to the situation under Antiochus IV. A defensive attitude can equally well be read as a sign that points to the Maccabean conflict. The suggestion that Jubilees has been redacted so that it reflects more than one period makes sense.[5] Further, it is noteworthy that the tendency to give priority to Levi may be interpreted as a reference to the priesthood in Maccabean times. By rooting priesthood in the election of Levi and by referring to Levi as "the priest of the Most High God" (Jub 32,1) the author may retroject the authority of the Hasmonean high priests back to the Old Testament patriarchs. Whether the reference is to Jonathan who in 153 BC became high priest and civil governor, or to Simon who was appointed high priest in 141 BC is not clear.[6] However, since it is not possible to give full attention to the problem of an exact date in one chapter, I shall presuppose that the Maccabean/Hasmonean conflict is the one alluded to. Besides, from the point of view of identity it is not absolutely necessary to locate the conflict at a particular point in history; it is sufficient to be aware of the fact that the threat Jubilees faces is from two sides. One risk is that foreign belief and customs will be imposed by law, that political powers introduce a non-Jewish practice. The other is from inside, that less strict interpretations of traditional laws are suggested and adopted as a new life-style, with the danger that traditional Jewish identity is lost. It seems that Jubilees chooses to address the danger of a changing identity to meet contemporary threats from outside as well as inside, since the form is to interpret the Sinai covenant.

As Jubilees stands it contains a retold story based on Gen 1,1-Exod 15,22, recording the establishment and renewal of the covenant. By using the Sinai event as frame for supplementing the divine revelation, authority is secured.[7] It is not possible from the book itself to locate its precise milieu.[8] However, its general concern is all Israel, with a particular

---

[5] Cf. Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology*, 1971.

[6] It is possible that there is an allusion to 1 Macc 14,41, Simon, as "high priest forever", as suggested by Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.179, but clear evidence is not found.
For more detailed discussions on date, see the works by Klaus Berger; G.L. Davenport; John C. Endres, George W.E. Nickelsburg, Eberhard Schwarz; James VanderKam, cf. my bibliography. For a brief survey see Emil Schürer, *History* III, 1, 1986, p.311-13; Georg Schelbert, *TRE*, 17, 1988, p.287.

[7] The anonymous writer takes God as subject of revelation about division of time to Israel, and of the giving of the law for Israel.

[8] There are clear indications as to the importance of Levi and his election to priesthood; it may be inferred, with Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.91-92, that the author has some connection to priestly circles, or possibly a Levitical milieu, because of a lack of criticism of contemporary

interest in Israel's state as God's chosen people. The demands on Israel not to compromise on issues of circumcision, intermarriage, celebration of festivals, and keeping the Sabbath point to a self-understanding of "normative Judaism",[9] rather than a particularistic community.[10] Although these issues could point to one particular political and/or social crisis, Jubilees' attempt to make its message timeless seems to reflect a concern with normative principles, aimed at uniting Israel. The particular calendar is not necessarily a reason for placing Jubilees outside mainstream Judaism of its time.[11] The same goes for the apocalyptic framework.[12] From my analysis

---

ritual structures.

[9] The term "normative Judaism" is coined by George Foot Moore, see for instance *Judaism* I, 1944, p.125. When using this I refer to the representative principles of Judaism, a broad spectrum of Judaism that is founded on theoretical knowledge and practical observance as opposed to an isolated group based on narrow principles.

[10] Thus e.g. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.362, (p.383-85 on calendar).
James C. VanderKam, *Studies*, 1977, argues for a proto-Essene background, giving three reasons, a) dualism, related with predestination, b) calendar and c) exegesis of Genesis, p.258-83.

[11] The calendar Jubilees presupposes operates with a luni-solar year of 364 days. Whether this is over against an older tradition of a lunar year of 354 days, against another luni-solar calendar (with 11 or 12 epagomenal days), or against a solar year of 365 days (12 lunar months with 10 epagomenal days) is impossible to say, because the opposed view is not given. The development is probably from lunar to solar calendar, not from solar to lunar, as pointed to by Solomon Gandz, in *Homenaje a Milás-Villicrosa*, 1954, p.623-46.
Jubilees may reflect a situation in which the authority of calendar calculation is opposed to the authority of calendar observations. In that case the point is that preference should be given to the calendar that is based on calculation, with roots in God's created order, because it serves as a useful tool for writing history, and for uniting the nation over against a calendar based on observations made in Jerusalem. For the point of observation, see Olaf Pedersen, *Gregorian Reform*, 1983, p.19.
It is important, as Phillip R. Callaway does, in an unpublished manuscript, to acknowledge the plurality of traditions and not attempt a harmonisation of these traditions on too narrow a basis.
The calendar question is far too complicated to be dealt with in this context, and I shall refrain from premature and prejudiced conclusion that the calendar, which may be a theoretical rather than practical calendar, indicates that Jubilees is outside the mainstream, normative Judaism of its time.

[12] It matters not whether one defines apocalypticism as does Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 1982, p.21, as "a type of religion whose distinguishing feature is a belief in direct revelation of the things of God which was mediated through dream, vision or divine intermediary." Or one prefers a definition like Bent Noack, *Spätjudentum*, 1971, p.54: "Dementsprechend gehört es jedenfalls mit zur Definition einer Apokalypse, dass sie den Zweck hat, 'zu zeigen, was im Bälde geschehen soll', wie es Apok 1,1 heisst. Und zwar gehört es m.E. nicht nur zur Definition sondern ist der entscheidende Faktor, so dass man nicht von Apokalypsen und Apokalyptik sprechen sollte, wo nicht die nächste Zukunft als entscheidendes und endgültiges Heilsereignis der eigentliche Gegenstand der 'Offenbarung' oder 'Entschleierung' des Geheimnisses ist."

below it will be clear that the call for separation is for separation from Gentiles, not separation from other Jews. Moreover, the concern is for the unity of the nation, not for a conversion to a group within Judaism. Thus, rather than discuss the exact conflict alluded to I shall demonstrate how reflections on the covenant stories aim at creating an awareness of being united with history, and how this awareness becomes an important factor for present and future national identity and is decisive for creating national and social boundaries.

I. Identity and Covenant Consciousness.

In the Book of Jubilees tradition plays a role as retold tradition,[13] re-interpreted biblical law.[14] By means of biblical interpretation an actualization of covenant and election is attempted with a view also to characterising the identity of the people.[15] Both the origin of the ritual system and the practice of the law, are evaluated from the point of view of contemporary society of the community behind the book. This point can be illustrated from the Prologue, in which the purpose is said to be to give "the account of the division of the days of the law and of the testimony....as the Lord gave it to Moses". From this introduction we may deduce two things. First, one purpose of the book is to give a full account of God's revelation. Because the law in general and the "heavenly tablets" in particular have a divine origin, it is important to state this and to remind the people that they have been given to be obeyed.[16] Secondly, when drawing on the idea of covenant from the Old Testament, the writer introduces Moses in order to focus on the written account of the divine

---

[13] For an interpretative approach, I refer to a recent monograph by John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, who compares the biblical texts with Jubilees, comments on omissions and additions, especially the Jacob traditions, and analyses the interpretive art of the book.

[14] Cf. Bent Noack, *Spätjudentum*, 1971, p.38-39: the purpose of the Book of Jubilees is not to write history, but to interpret law.

[15] Cf. Georg Schelbert, *TRE* 17, 1988, p.288.

[16] The heavenly tablets in Jubilees contain all the liturgical and ethical commands to Israel given from creation, including the plan or creation revealed to Moses (cf. 4,21). Thus, the Old Testament laws that have a special significance for the readers at the time when Jubilees was written, are given a special prominence (Jub 3,10.31; 4,32; 5,13; 6,17; 15,25; 16,29; 24,33; 30,9; 32.15.28; 33,10). Another set of tablets contain the human behaviour, kept until the day of judgment (Jub 4,5-6; 16,9; 19,9; 30,19 - 29; 31,32). In one specific case they are said to reveal future events to Jacob (32,21).
The content of the tablets is not identical to the law, as stressed by Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.75; cf. also Solomon Zeitlin, *JQR* 30, 1939-40, p.230-31, and *JQR* 48, 1957-58, p.8; Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.196; Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.52-55; and George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 1981, p.74-75.

command which the author claims is aimed at future generations of Israel (1,5). Thus it is clear that Jubilees' aim is to communicate the divine will to all Israel, and not just to a particular group within it. From the angle of identity as covenant consciousness, the questions to pursue are, How is the covenant interpreted? Is it in continuity with the Old Testament? Or in contrast? If there is a change of emphasis, What is it? From a theological point of view, identity has its roots primarily in the concept of God, because a covenant relationship has God as partner or initiator. Is there a consciousness of God being the guarantor of covenant validity, as in the Old Testament?

(1) God and Covenant Validity.

Generally speaking the concept of God in Jubilees is close to the Old Testament concept of God. The existence of God, God's revelation in history and the unique covenant relationship between God and Israel, with its social and ethical consequences, are presupposed. I shall first examine how the writer of Jubilees reuses both the Old Testament image of God as a transcendent being who becomes manifest in historical actions,[17] and the idea of God as a caring being; and then point to the idea of God as guarantor of the covenant.

The overall impression in Jubilees is that God is transcendent, a creator God. It is noteworthy that although the creation and division of time (Jub 1,1; 1,26) are valid for humanity in general, God's particular concern for Israel has its origin in creation. The order of time is created for Israel (cf. 1,5-18).[18] Tied to the idea of God as creator is the idea of God as the organizer of law and order who has given a special order for Israel. By communicating the divine will and demonstrating that God is the centre of and source of revelation, Jubilees, on the one hand has Israel as receiver of this revelation, and on the other hand identifies the covenant with Israel from its origin in God, as one covenant. A central theme in all this is that God has chosen Israel as a special people. Since this is presented already in the story of creation, it follows that the election of Israel too is seen as having its origin in creation and its source in the creator God.[19]

---

[17] Cf. Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.110.

[18] Cf. Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.74-78. The order of creation is divine law. From this follows that a solar calendar is rooted in creation, therefore divine. The sun is the great sign of creation in Jub 2,8-10 (cf. 6,29-38), while little attention is given to the moon.
Creation is the beginning of history for Israel, and here lies the origin of what is specific to Israel's identity, its festivals (Jub 6,18), the Sabbath (Jub 2,19), hence its special status.

[19] This is true not only from the retold creation story (Jub 2,1-3,16) but

On the one hand, Jubilees describes God in abstract categories by using expressions as, "God of heaven",[20] "God Most High"[21] and "God of all".[22] Related to this is the the idea that God is a God of love, particularly clear when the relationship between God and Israel is imaged as a father-child relationship.[23] Note that the most comprehensive description of God is concerned with God as love who has a covenant relationship with Israel,

> "For he is the loving God, and holy and faithful and righteous above all: he does not respect persons and he cannot be bribed; for he is a righteous God and executes judgment on all who transgress his commandments and despise his covenant" (Jub 21,4).

The use of these expressions testifies to the belief in the transcendence of God, to divine power, and to universal rule as opposed to nationalistic rule. However, for Jubilees this divine power is revealed and known especially to Israel.

On the other hand, although the opening of the book (1,1-3) draws on Exod 24,15-18 with its imagery of cloud and fire, such concrete imagery is not typical of the book. Instead, the author shares the tendency of contemporary writers to substitute abstract language for concrete imagery.[24] Thus, God is seen as the majestic ruler who, like a king, surrounded by a court of angels, rules the world, and the angel of presence is representative of God.[25] Angels as watchers (Jub 4,15) and teachers of what is just and right act as mediators for God.[26] Highest in the hierarchy is the angel of the

---

more so in the interpretation of it.
The Sabbath's origin in creation, the fact that is given to Israel alone (Jub 2,19-21) as a blessing (Jub 2,21.24), both to celebrate as a festival of joy (50,10), and to celebrate with God and the angels on earth and in heaven (Jub 2,17), makes it important as identification mark. The command to Moses to keep the Sabbath is renewed (Jub 50) and intensified.

[20] Cf. Jub 12,4; 20,7; 22,19.

[21] Cf. Jub 12,19; 13,16; 20,9; 22,11.13.19.23.27; 25,21.

[22] Cf. Jub 22,10.27; 30,19; 31,13.32.

[23] Cf. Jub 1,24-25; 2,20 and 19,29: God as Father elects Israel as Son.

[24] Cf. Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.219.

[25] Thus the manifest presence of God is concealed when the angel speaks on behalf of God and when the author substitutes angels ("we") for God in the stories. See e.g. Jub 3,1; 12,25; 16,1-4; 18,14; 48,13.
Similarly, when the angel of presence speaks, or writes on tablets (Jub 1,27.29), in accordance with God's command (Jub 2,1-2) or when angels are given authority over nations (Jub 15,31-32).

[26] Angels do not replace God, but speak on behalf of God, and act on God's command. They are counted among God's creation (Jub 2,2) serving God and humanity from the place they have been assigned to by God. Angels rule the nations (15,31), with the exception of Israel who is ruled directly by God (15,32). On angels, see further Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960,

presence who has the role of interpreter for Israel of events in history, and mediator of divine obligations.[27] Finally, concrete imagery is present in the belief that God has a special concrete dwelling place on earth, a place of presence in Jerusalem, with Israel referred to as the temple on Zion. This is evident from the following eschatological promise,

> "I will build my sanctuary in their midst and I will dwell with them and be their God, and they shall be my people in truth and righteousness" (1,17).

This shows that the author of the Book of Jubilees particularises the covenant relationship with the transcendent God, to be a covenant with Israel. This, then, raises the specific question whether there is in the Book of Jubilees, as in the Old Testament, a special awareness of God as guarantor of the established covenant. In Chapter One I demonstrated this point from the encounter and experience of God who made a covenant with Noah, Abraham and Moses. When these covenant stories are retold in Jubilees, the theological emphasis has to a certain degree changed in comparison with the Old Testament. This is partly due to the less anthropomorphic image of God in Jubilees, but essentially the change of emphasis is due to the role given to the angel of presence writing eternal laws on "heavenly tablets".[28] I shall illustrate this from three examples in the remainder of this section.

First, in the story of Noah, Jubilees omits the point that the rainbow is a sign of God's remembering the covenant; and it adds to God's promise, not to destroy creation, that God promises not to change the prescribed order for time and seasons.[29] Thus,

Gen 8,22:	Jub 6,4:
As long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease.	While the earth last, seedtime and harvest, should never cease, and that cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night, should not change their order or ever cease.

By introducing the idea of a created order into the covenant with Noah, even tying it to the Sinai covenant (6,11), the author establishes that covenant

---

p.75-86.

[27] The "I" in Jubilees is the angel of presence who speaks with authority to Moses, the "you", and writes God's message on heavenly tablets interpreting the entire Torah and commenting on events from creation to the revelation on Sinai (Jub 2,1-50,13).

[28] The recurring references to the heavenly tablets serve as references to God's faithfulness.

[29] The importance of the order as God's created order is stressed by Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.73-4.

validity is grounded in the order God had contemplated before creation and set in motion at creation (3,2). In this way the author interprets validity differently. Validity is no longer, as in the Old Testament, tied to the rainbow as sign given by God for both God and humanity, but is now tied to the seasonal order of creation adding a special concern for its validity to Israel. The change is clearly a change from covenant with humanity to covenant with Israel.

Secondly, the Abraham story, retold in Jub 14, is very close to Gen 15. But Jubilees adds that the covenant with Abraham is a renewal of the covenant with Noah, emphasising that this must take place in the future Israel, when Israel celebrates the covenant on the exact and same day on which the covenant was first made.[30] The covenant is one and the same relationship, its validity rests in the created order. However, the universal character of the Noah covenant has been changed to a more particularistic one when the Abrahamic covenant is narrowed by stressing Israel's obligation to renew the covenant.

Thirdly, as mentioned above, Jubilees takes its starting point in the Sinai event (Exod 19,1 and 24,12), seen as covenant renewal.[31] This is clear from Jub 6,11 when Moses is ordered to make a covenant with Israel, to restore the existing relationship.[32] There is in Jubilees apparently no knowledge of a complex event or several encounters between Moses and God. Rather, Jubilees envisages the Sinai event as one single encounter that took place in the same month in which the covenant with Noah was made (cf. Jub 1,1).[33] Further, when Jubilees recalls the 40 days (Jub 1,4) in which Moses is given instruction to write a book (Jub 1,5), and introduces the angel of presence as writer of the tablets and interpreter of the history from creation to the new creation (Jub 1,29), the aim is to emphasise that the covenant is a restoration of what has already been established with Noah. It is not a different relationship. This means that for Jubilees the validity of the Sinai covenant is based on the idea of God's fidelity to creation and of God as the God of order, as this appears to Moses on the heavenly tablets. Thus,

---

[30] "Renewal" is thus not understood as replacement, but rather as a reinforcement of its validity. Renewal is from the point of view of God a reestablishment of an existing valid relationship, and from the point of Israel, renewal is a response to the divine demand; it may be particularly associated with the festival of covenant renewal, or with accepting the conditions of being born within a covenant and all that it entails.

[31] Cf. Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.205.

[32] Note that the command to Moses to establish a covenant with Israel is given in a context of the covenant with Noah in Jub 6,11.

[33] Cf. also the reference to the date in 1,1 and 6,19.

> "Regarding the Israelites it has been written and ordained: "If they turn to him in the right way, he will forgive all their wickedness and will pardon all their sins". It has been written and ordained that he will have mercy on all who turn from all their errors once each year" (Jub 5,17-18).[34]

Jubilees refers to God as faithful to the promise of forgiveness, so that God, in spite of Israel's shortcomings and breaking of the covenant, will forgive Israel provided it turns to God. However, God will also act as judge according to what has once been ordained, or proclaimed,

> "And God said, Listen carefully to everything that I tell you on this mountain, and write it in a book so that the generations *to come* may see how I have not forsaken them on account of all the evil they have done in transgressing the covenant[35] that I am establishing between me and you on Mt. Sinai today for *all* their generations. And so, when all these things have happened to them, they will recognize that I am more righteous than they are in all they think and do, and they will recognize that I have kept faith with them" (Jub 1,5-6).

The point in this passage is not only that God, by giving a record of law and order, is ruler of the universe; the order is one to which even the divine will must submit. The order is valid precisely because it is recorded. So, if the order is valid for God, it must be even more valid for Israel to whom the records are revealed. This belief in the fidelity of God is fundamental to the covenant relationship because on this rests the authority of promise and law for the present Israel. In other words, covenant validity cannot be separated from the idea of God as faithful, God as order.

In sum, For the author of Jubilees the belief in God is expressed in concrete Old Testament images as well as more abstract terms; hence a belief in a creator of the universe who has a special relationship with Israel is expressed. Although the place for the presence of God is in heaven with angels, God has a particular presence on earth, manifest in the joint celebration of the Sabbath, a celebration that identifies the present Israel

---

[34] Translation from James C. VanderKam.

[35] The English translations, (Rabin, VanderKam and Wintermute) all translate "covenant", while the German (Berger) and the Danish (Noack) render "Ordnung", "ordning", which is to be preferred, because the covenant is already in existence. What is established with Moses on Sinai is a covenant taking the form of obligations.
The evidence for this is that according to Jub 1,1, the commandments are given the day following the renewal of the covenant, that is on the 16th day of the 3rd month, cf. same date in 44,5. In contrast to this the covenant with Noah and Abraham are on the 15th day of the 3rd month, cf. 6,10.11; 14,20; 15,1; 16,13; 44,4. Significant is also the 1st day of the 3rd month which introduces covenant renewals, cf. 6,1; 14,1; 44,1.
See for this Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.79 and Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.188. 204. 226.

as a people belonging to God, not just in abstract terms, but referring concretely to Jerusalem as place of promise. The heavenly tablets testify to the existence of an eternal validity, to God as faithful; hence covenant of both law and order is valid for Israel. Thus, when Jubilees presents the creator God as a covenant God this serves the purpose of reinforcing Israel's present and past identity. It particularises on the one hand the covenant relationship with God manifest in past covenants with Israel, and on the other hand it actualises these covenants in one covenant valid for contemporary Israel.

(2) Covenant Consciousness and Identity of Israel.

As has been observed in Chapter One, the covenant relationship with God is expressed in various ways. It is remarkable that the Book of Jubilees begins the retold biblical story with the Sinai event, assuming that the covenant exists (1,1), that the covenant is, as in the Old Testament, established on God's initiative. Further, it is essential to Jubilees that the contemporary Israel is aware of its covenant relationship (Jub 1,5-6). How, then, does the Book of Jubilees see covenant consciousness related to Israel's present identity as a people?

In Jubilees it is clear that for Israel to have a covenant with God means to be under an obligation to obey the will of God, because covenant signs are given for all generations to observe.[36] By no means does this deny that obligations are interrelated with blessings. On the contrary, because the covenant is seen as a divine act of grace and love, promises and obligations are integral to covenant relationship.[37] A covenant can however be broken. And it is characteristic of Jubilees that it is the human party, being evil and disobedient, that breaks the relationship. To this God's answer is judgment and destruction, or if the people repents God answers with forgiveness.

The classification of the four covenant aspects, suggested by the Old Testament material, needs to be modified when I now turn to the covenant consciousness of the Book of Jubilees, mainly because covenant blessings and obligations cannot easily be separated. Instead I shall adopt Ernst Lohmeyer's paradigm whereby "covenant" has a past, a present and a future

---

[36] Thus Sabbath (Jub 1,10.14), Circumcision (Jub 15,25-29), festivals (e.g. Jub 6,1-4), law and ordinances (e.g. Jub 1,5).

[37] This is pointed out by E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.375. 383.
Previous to him, see Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, who states, p.79, "Nicht das Gesetz und die Ordnung sondern Gottes gnädiger Bund mit den Menschen ist das primäre und grundlegende."

meaning.[38] When this is applied to the Book of Jubilees, we shall see that (a) covenant consciousness has a historical dimension, tied as it is to Israel in the past, (b) it amounts to a certainty of the present validity of the covenant, and consequently it affects the whole present national, social and religious life of the people. Simultaneously Jubilees expects (c) the eternal covenant with Israel to be the future manifestation of its relationship with God, a life of peace and joy.

(a) Past relationships. Of importance to the understanding of covenant consciousness in Jubilees is the idea of covenant as memorial, hence the association of covenant with certain historical individuals.[39] The important incidents are: the foundation of the covenant with Noah, Abraham (and Isaac), Jacob and Moses, each time with promises more specific than on previous occasions. And each time the covenant is recalled and/or renewed, covenant obligations are added and often intensified. From the point of view of how Jubilees has been organized as a book of revelation, the covenant establishment with Moses is most important. It stands for the ultimate renewal of previous relationships, being the final recapitulation of past covenants. Thus, when Moses is commanded to go to Sinai to receive the tablets of the law as a last sign from God of the covenant validity, this serves the purpose of confirming past promises (Jub 1,5) combined with an eschatological hope (Jub 1,27-28) and reminder of the eternal value of the covenant obligations. The reason for this initiative from God is that the covenant has been disregarded by Israel (Jub 1,10-13). The repeated commands to Moses to write specific laws function in general to reinforce their validity,[40] and in particular to interpret specific laws having a divine origin, by giving them a validity that spans from creation to eternity. The general warning not to break the covenant functions to ensure Israel of God's continued favour towards the covenant people. However, this raises the question, What causes the author of Jubilees to rewrite the history before Sinai? The simple fact that it is retold and reinterpreted makes it important to a present self-understanding of being a people, and I shall now demonstrate why.

---

[38] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.111-15. He is more precise than Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, who defines covenant as, "conclue avec les Pères, basée sur le Loi, en marche vers l'avenir", p.95.
Lohmeyer's category of future covenant coincides with what was termed covenant renewal, above, in Chapter One.

[39] They may appear in stories as individuals, but in a wider perspective they are representatives of the people.

[40] See Jub 1,27; 2,26.29; 6,11-13; 6,20.32.38; 15,28; 23,32; 30.11.17.21; 33,18; 41,26; 49,15.22.

The first institution of the covenant begins when Noah offers a sacrifice of atonement (6,1).[41] As the story is told, this incident emphasises the importance of sacrifices. It is almost as if sacrifices initiate the relationship and induce God's blessings to Noah and all families on earth, and God's promise not to destroy the earth and not to change the order of time and seasons (Jub 6,4). As in Genesis, the story contains a promise of offspring (Jub 6,5) which Jubilees sees fulfilled by counting the present people as descendants of Noah. The law, from Gen 9,1-7, to abstain from consuming blood and killing other human beings (Jub 6,10), is repeated and intensified, now as an eternal law, valid for all generations. By adding the demand for renewal (Jub 6,17), the writer grounds present praxis in a distant past (Jub 6,19). Thereby a change of emphasis takes place. For Jubilees this change is clearly one related to present identity. By retelling the story, the author provides a rationale for the festival of renewal and for its importance, being valid through all generations (Jub 6,20.24.28.35).[42] In this way the annual celebration of the covenant becomes an identity mark for all Israel (cf. 6,11), a unifying factor, when Israel responds by a visible sign to the covenant relationship once initiated by God, and celebrated also in the past. Thus by celebrating the same covenant as past generations, present Israel accepts its covenant status thereby pointing to its validity.[43]

The second covenant is, as in Genesis, with Abraham. As demonstrated in Chapter One, the Abrahamic covenant is characterised as a covenant of a double promise, land and offspring.[44] As in Gen 17,19-21, the promise of the birth of Isaac is part of this double promise since the birth is interpreted as a sign of the covenant.[45] By adding the date of birth, not found in Gen

---

[41] As James C. VanderKam, in *Ideal Figures*, 1980, p.13-32, has demonstrated, Jubilees pictures Noah as a perfect priest, who "atoned for the earth" (Jub 6,11.12.13; 8,21; 9,14). Further, Noah is the model for righteousness, which is the reason for escaping the judgment of the flood, hence he becomes an eschatological model; hence the passage on the judgment of "all", cf. Jub 5,13-18.

[42] John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.202, believes that the writer of Jubilees wished to "upgrade" the feast of the covenant (Feast of Shabuot) for the contemporary community, by retrojecting its date as well as the rationale for it back to Noah, by stressing the point of renewal with Abraham and Moses. However, he does not give sufficient weight to the feast as a unifying factor for the people.

[43] See Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.108.

[44] See Jub 14,18-20; 15,4-11; cf. 12,22-29 and 13,3.

[45] Cf. Jub 15,19-21. The birth of Isaac in Jubilees is recorded to have taken place on the day of the feast of the covenant (Jub 16,13), and therefore Isaac is son of promise. For this point, see Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.103.

21,1-7, Jubilees interprets the covenant as promise fulfilled with Isaac, adding a dimension of divine planning. As in Genesis, the promise of land and offspring is renewed to Isaac in Jub 24,8-12 (cf. Gen 26,1-5).[46] And like Genesis 17, Jubilees stresses circumcision as a visible sign of the covenant (Jub 15,11-13 cf. 16,14), without connecting it to the promise of land and offspring.[47] This leads to the idea, to which I shall return below in II (2), that circumcision is a covenant obligation, by means of which Israel affirms and accepts the covenant (Jub 15,25). Important also are the added prescriptions in Jub 21,5-20 on sacrifices, blood and purity, given to Isaac by Abraham. This indicates that Jubilees accepts the sacrificial system. By rooting sacrifices, abstention from blood and purity laws in the time of Noah and Abraham, sacrificial laws are given a rationale and purpose of uniting the past with present Israel. Thus, when covenant consciousness is tied to those laws, Israel is marked off with a different identity from its neighbours.[48]

The third example is the covenant with Jacob. Rather unexpectedly, the covenant stories reach their climax in the stories in which Jacob is the key figure. For this Jub 27,22-24 is central because it contains a revelation from God who promises blessings through Jacob, following Genesis 28,13. However, Jubilees changes the "families of the earth" to "countries of the nations".[49] This makes the promise refer to Israel in a more particularistic and nationalistic way since it advocates a separation between Israel and the Gentiles.[50] More importantly, the promises of offspring and land to Jacob and his descendants have connotations of greatness and universal dominion, so that a new dimension[51] with a jurisdictional aspect is added to the Jacob story from Gen 35,10-15.[52] Thus,

---

[46] Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.65, takes Jub 20,11, "and he gave his son Isaac everything" to imply that Isaac was given not only material goods, but blessings, promises and obligations of the covenant. But the context of 20,1-13 only suggests the promise of land, since the admonition to all the sons of Abraham contain the obligation to circumcise, to keep away from idolatry, fornication as well as blessings, and following that, the sons of Abraham are sent away to live "in all the land that is to the east" (20,11).

[47] Cf. Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.81.

[48] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.380; Meinrad Limbeck, Ibid., p.81-82.

[49] Cf. Jub 27,23 and the notes to this by C. Rabin, Jubilees, 1984, p.87, and Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.257.

[50] For this point, see John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.99.

[51] Klaus Berger, JSHRZ II, 1981, p.484, interprets it as a universalistic dimension. However, the emphasis is on dominion, on Israel's superiority. See further below in II (1).

[52] Both these aspects belong to the Davidic tradition and covenant.

> "And (God) said to him again, I am the Lord who created heaven and earth, and I will increase you and multiply you greatly, and kings shall spring from you, and they shall sit in judgment in every land wherever man have set their feet. And I will give to your descendants all the earth that is under heaven, and they shall judge all the nations in accordance with their desires, and after that they shall gain possession of the entire earth and inherit it forever" (Jub 32,18-19).

The different tradition in Jubilees also elaborates that no holy place is built in Bethel, no offering takes place. An angel appears in a vision (32,21) and says in 32,22,

> "Do not start building at this place and do not make it either an eternal sanctuary or a permanent abode; for this is not the chosen place."

By letting the angel prevent the erection of a holy place in Bethel, Jubilees indicates that Jerusalem is the future geographical centre of holiness of Israel (Jub 32,21-24).[53] If this story is seen in terms of the covenant and election of Zion, then the Old Testament centralization of the cult in the Davidic covenant is retrojected into the Jacob tradition, and implicitly the boundaries of the Davidic kingdom are reclaimed in the prophecy of universal rule in Jub 31,18-20.[54] If this is correct then Israel's identity depends on Jerusalem as its present geographical centre of holiness.

The special role assigned to Jacob is seen on several occasions, in predictions and promises revealed to Jacob.[55] Thus the author retrojects the election of Jacob, hence of the people, back to the time and order of creation when it is revealed to the angels that Jacob is elect and holy (Jub 2,20).[56] The purpose seems to be to create a present corporate consciousness

---

[53] Cf. Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.269, "Abraham's house" is probably a designation for Jerusalem.
John C. Endres, Ibid., p.167, suggests that this passage testifies to an anti-Bethel polemic, a polemic against an alternative cult. And independently of Noack, he suggests, p.168, Jerusalem, Zion, as the centre for cult; cf. Jub 18,13.

[54] A comparison to Ps 132, 13-14 shows the parallels, "the Lord has chosen Zion", and God's "resting place forever".
Cf. also 2 Sam 7, where David's plans to build a house are changed by God, and also 1 Kings 5,5. See above in Chapter One.
I believe this point is more important than the anti-Bethel motif, suggested by Endres, cf. previous note. By combining the promise of dominion with the choice of a location for God Jubilees can place this election even earlier in history than the Davidic tradition allows for.

[55] Apart from Jub 27,22-24 and 32,18-19 mentioned above, note especially 32,21 where the heavenly tablets are shown to Jacob who reads all about the future, for himself and his sons, for eternity. See, Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.72; Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.99-100; E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.363.

[56] Thus it is also known to Abraham and to Rebecca (Jub 22,11-24; 22,27-30

of being elect within the community.

In sum. The covenant establishment with Noah and the subsequent renewals are all past events which Jubilees re-uses to reinterpret Israel's history for its present readership. The tendency to give a patriarchal framework to the cultic, legislative and executive power in Israel strikes one as a deliberate attempt to interpret the covenant as having a foundation as far back in history as possible. Moreover, by interpreting the past for the present community the aim is to create an awareness of a special relationship with God, whose faithfulness guarantees the validity of the covenant relationship, and to whose demands the present community therefore needs to respond. The ultimate aim is that contemporary Israel will be more aware of its covenant obligations.

(b) Marks of Israel's Present Identity. I have demonstrated how Jubilees retells traditional stories concerning the covenant, selects and sometimes elaborates the biblical stories, to give the tradition a particular emphasis. It is therefore appropriate at this point to ask more specifically about the promises of land and offspring. If covenant includes a promise of land, How important is this promise? If covenant is remembered as promise of people, How is this related to the existence of Israel as a nation? What is the relationship between recalled covenant events and present consciousness of being in a covenant relationship?

The promise of land can be seen as one of the recurring themes of Jubilees, although it is not a major concern.[57] Thus, the motif is found in Jub 13,1-9, the story of Abraham taking possession of a territory given to Shem (Jub 8,18-21.30), illegitimately taken in possession by Canaan (Jub 10,30). Or again, it is found in Jub 44,6-7, showing that although Jacob went to Egypt on account of famine it was with a promise of a future return to the land of Abraham. And finally, the motif is present in the remarks to Moses (Jub 50,4) that the land is a land of promise (Jub 1,7), although the exodus from Egypt has taken place (Jub 49). So, what does the claim of the land mean to the contemporary reader of Jubilees?

---

and 25,15-23).
For an excellent discussion of the importance of Jacob, see John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, esp. chapters III and IV.

[57] John C. Endres comments on the story about the purchase of the Machpelah cave in Jub 19. The fact that Jubilees (19,9) adds that Abraham did not mention the promise of land at the time of the sale, shows a shift from interest in land to interest in Abraham's fidelity. It further points to an interest in Abraham as a model for the contemporary community. See Ibid., p.20-21.48-49.

The question of land is a question not only of geographical territory, but rather a question of a place given by God to identify Israel as a nation. This adds a theological dimension to the promise of land, clear when one looks at the references to the dwelling places of God in Jub 4,26[58] and 8,19. The three dwelling places, Sinai, Eden and Zion[59] are holy places because the presence of God is associated with them in a particular way. When therefore "holy" is applied to the temple, as in Jub 1,10.27; 23,21 and 30,15, it designates in a particular way that the present temple is the centre for God's presence in and with Israel. An extension of holiness from the centre to the city and the land is close at hand. Even if the term "holy" is not used in relation to the land, the idea is not far off when the land is envisaged as a "pure" land, as in the prophecy in Jub 50,5. The implication is that the promise to Moses contains a promise of the eternal presence of God conditional upon the nation's covenant obedience, attached to the possession of the land.[60] This leads to the conclusion that without its territorial space, Israel's present identity would be threatened because lack of geographical boundaries implies lack of a place for God. Moreover, the lack of a special territory ruled by the people chosen to rule the earth (Jub 32,18-19) implies a lack of power for Israel and its God.

The issue of people can be seen from more than one angle, but here I shall deal primarily with the question as to how Jubilees defines the people as being different from other peoples. The consciousness of belonging to Israel as a nation includes first of all a consciousness of priority over other nations.[61] Hence it includes the idea that Israel is under obligation to keep its identity intact and distinct from that of other people. With this particular obligation covenant identity becomes tied to a demand for separation.[62]

---

[58] Jub 4,26 has four places, the fourth a mountain in the east, but it is unnamed and therefore impossible to place geographically. Either the tradition is deliberately blurred, or the place is to be understood mythologically. Cf. Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, 1958, p.200.213; Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.48-51.

[59] All within the territory of Shem.
Sinai is associated with covenant revelation in the past, Eden with creation, and Zion, Jerusalem, is associated with the contemporary place of worship and cult.

[60] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.367.

[61] So Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.112. The consciousness of priority is related to election, which I deal with more fully in section II (1) below.

[62] In many ways I am in debt to Eberhard Schwarz's important work, *Identität*, 1982, where he argues from segregation to identity, but he seems, nevertheless, to diminish the importance of the role of the covenant in creating a consciousness of identity. In spite of the statement (p.21), "Die Forderung nach Abgrenzung erscheint dabei als die wesentliche Bundesbestimmung", it is in election, in the idea of the holy people, that he finds a

And when Jubilees does that, the idea is that there is a fundamental contrast between holiness (and purity) and profanity (and uncleanness), or an antithesis between a holy nation and unclean Gentiles; and also between the righteous and sinners within Israel.[63] In the terminology of Mary Douglas,[64] "separateness" means holiness, to be holy means belonging to God. Since for Jubilees belonging is concrete belonging to a nation, the contrast between clean and unclean is here related to life and practice of the nation, and thus separation is concrete separation between Israel and Gentiles.

The most important provisions and obligations are: the prohibition of intermarriage, an attempt to keep strangers out on the premise that those who worship other gods are a danger to the holiness of the people;[65] the obligation to keep the Sabbath, a concrete sign of Israel's status whereby those who keep this law have marked themselves as belonging to the holy nation whose task is to celebrate the Sabbath;[66] the command to celebrate the festivals which is identity-related, because those who celebrate affirm the social and religious (cultic) unity of the people, so that by participating they maintain holiness;[67] abstaining from blood which belongs to the category of food laws that express the distinction between holiness and uncleanness,

---

documentation for identity. p.85-88.

[63] I shall return to this in a context of election in II (1).

[64] See *Purity*, 1966. 1984, p.41-57.

[65] Particularly in the context of demand to Jacob not to marry a daughter of Canaan, Jub 25,1-3 (cf. 22,20) over against the example of Esau. See, Eberhard Schwarz, Ibid., p.32-34.
The other important text is Jub 30, the rape of Dinah. Compared to Gen 34, Jubilees omits that the Shechemites as part of a deal to marry Dinah submitted to circumcision, thus the unsavoury deed of Simeon and Levi is changed to be a just revenge. For a detailed analysis of this episode, see John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.120-154. See also below in II (1).

[66] Through observation of the Sabbath Israel can be separated from other nations, and be set apart to have a special status for God (Jub Prol. 1,4.26-29; 2,17-33; 50). This is E.P. Sanders' point in *Paul*, 1977, p.363-4, although he seems to base the status on election, not on covenant. Cf. also Eberhard Schwarz, Ibid., p.86-98.

[67] The order in which the festivals are mentioned is significant, because first, the festival of Weeks, linked with Noah and the establishment of the covenant (Jub 6,17), then the festival of Sukkoth, tied to Abraham celebrating the birth of Isaac (Jub 16,29), then the day of atonement, referring back to Jacob mourning Joseph (Jub 34,12.18), and finally the Passover, building on Exod 12 (Jub 49) and alluded to in the sacrifice of Isaac (Jub 17,15; 18,13.19), are all past events seen with the eyes of Moses, therefore all memorial feasts, but also festivals tied into the present sacrificial system.
See e.g. Emil Schürer, *History*, III, 1, 1986, p.310, note 4, "The originality of Jubilees lies in the constant effort of the author to represent the yearly festivals of Judaism as memorials of events that occurred in the age of the patriarchs long before the time of Moses."

so that social custom expresses religious identity;[68] finally, submitting to circumcision, an identity issue, because those who keep this command affirm what covenant status amounts to.[69] In other words, these concrete obligations function primarily in Jubilees as identity marks in the contemporary society; they set inclusive or exclusive boundaries by drawing demarcation lines between inside and outside, since they are markers of a religious and social identity.

To sum up. Basically the present identity is tied to the promise of land and the existence of the people, which builds on the divine guarantee. Since a holy people needs its special place with firm and clear boundaries, Jubilees calls for the separation of Israel, with the underlying assumption that present Israel has a special status, a special place, and a special identity to guard. By urging the readers to be conscious of what belonging to the people meant in the past, the author of Jubilees sanctions the call for separation for the sake of preserving Israel's present national status. To the individual as well as to the people as a whole this status is marked by concrete observances, which guard the religious and social identity of Israel.

(c) Orientation Towards the Future. Remembered past covenants and consciousness of present covenant identity are linked in both form and content in the Book of Jubilees.[70] When Moses is reminded of neglect and betrayal of the covenant this is formulated as a prophecy of judgment,

> "And many will perish; and others will be taken captive and fall into the enemy's hands, because they have forsaken my law and my commandment, and the festivals of my covenant and my sabbaths, and my holy offerings which I have hallowed for myself in their midst, and my tabernacle, and my sanctuary which I have hallowed for myself in the midst of the land to make it a dwelling-place for my name" (Jub 1,10).

This passage can be taken in a narrow sense to refer to the history leading up to the Sinai covenant, but, without excluding this as one possibility, it is better understood as an address aimed at the reader of Jubilees. Consequently, it must be taken as a warning, a reminder of the future implica-

---

[68] See Jub 6,7-14.38 (cf. 7,31-32). Note the addition that this will keep Israel from extinction (6,13 cf. 21,6-20).
For the idea that dietary rules are closely related to the idea of holiness, hence important identity marks, marks of separation, see Mary Douglas, *Purity*, 1984, p.54; E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.365.

[69] I shall limit myself to circumcision, for reasons I have stated above in my Introduction.

[70] As I said above on p.64, Jubilees interprets law. However, because the frame is a revelation to Moses that aims at Israel reaching a pure status (cf. Jub 50,5) and has the future generations of Moses as a goal (cf. Jub 1,5), there is a clear link in the set up of past, present and future.

tions of neglecting the covenant, of the consequences of violating its obligations. What is at stake is the whole existence of the nation, which can only be guarded by boundaries. Since the holiness of God is reflected in the national identity, boundaries are set around Israel to separate it from other nations. The belief that the covenant relationship is permanent also contains a hope for a perfect future relationship without sin, evil and deceit, a hope sustained, when God promises that Israel

> "will turn to me from among the Gentiles with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their strength" (Jub 1,15).

However, the instructions to stay holy and separate from other nations are accompanied also by a message of judgment and of hope for the people when God,

> "will grant them an age of peace and righteousness and set them apart as an upright plant ... be a blessing and not a curse" (Jub 1,16),

when God promises,

> "I will build my sanctuary in their midst and I will dwell with them and be their God, and they shall be my people in truth and righteousness" (Jub 1,17),

and says,

> "I will create in them a holy spirit and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from me again, from that day and till eternity" (Jub 1,23), "they shall be called children of the living God" (Jub 1,24).

This takes place when God descends and dwells with the people for ever (1,26), when, in those days peace and blessing, healing and joy will excel (23,29). Such a vision of a perfect relationship created by God for God's people is expected to last for ever. The change is expected to be God's creative initiative, but it will also be a result of Israel's conversion. It is expected to include all Israel, and find its realisation in the land of the covenant promise.[71]

Jubilees does not expect a whole new world order, nor a new covenant,[72] nor a new law, unlike Jeremiah. Rather, what is expected is that Israel will accept the already existing covenant and law, that it will keep the commands because they are valid, given by God for eternal relationship. Thus, the goal for a future perfect status is for the whole people, the hope is to become and be a holy nation, a "friend" of God, on the model of Abraham, cf. Jub 30,20.

---

[71] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.370-3.

[72] Cf. E.P. Sanders, Ibid, p.370-73, and Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.74-114.

In conclusion. The purpose of presenting the retold stories based on the Old Testament is to create a covenant consciousness in the present community. This is particularly clear in additions, omissions and the new emphases of the Genesis stories. Not only do the retold covenant stories serve as a foundation for the present self-understanding of the people, they also set its goal. Moreover, by indicating what is of special concern to the past, contemporary society is shown what it needs to guard at present. By recalling the past, the eternal validity of the promises and obligations is set in relief to present covenant and law. Thus by clarifying that identity entails keeping the law, the legal principle for contemporary society is explained and separation is given a rationale. Without a foundation in the past the wider perspective of theological and social identity is either lacking or distorted, but with this foundation covenantal identity has both a sameness and a validity since the laws of society are rooted in the divine order. Hence the special status Jubilees believes contemporary Israel to have can be protected against threats, either from outside - Gentile culture - or from inside - lack of covenant consciousness.

II. Israel's Boundaries.

Having demonstrated that the Book of Jubilees reinterprets the Old Testament traditions to build a foundation for a covenant consciousness, to create a present awareness in Israel of its priority among other peoples, I shall now turn to boundaries. This is a matter of inclusion in and exclusion from Israel, and it raises the question whether circumcision functions as an internal boundary mark, a rite of affirmation, or as an external marker, a rite of initiation, or both. Before answering this it is necessary to consider boundaries from the perspective of election.

(1) Election Means Exclusion.

If covenant and election are in tension, this is visible as a tension between inclusive and exclusive boundaries. The problem arises when identity is narrowed down to election because a belief in election creates boundaries of exclusion. I shall illustrate my point from Jubilees' reinterpretation of some of the covenant stories in which the setting of boundaries to the outside through separation is dealt with. Thus, when Jubilees retells the Genesis stories on covenant, exclusiveness is found all the way through in the reinterpretation of the Old Testament traditions. The covenant with Noah and Abraham, the special interest in Jacob's status and the emphasis on Levi's election all point to a narrow identity that sets boundaries to the non-elect. By analysing (a) what Jubilees says of Jacob and Levi, and (b) what Jubilees sees as conditions for maintaining an identity as elect, I

shall show that election is an exclusive relationship.

(a) When reinterpreting the figure of Jacob Jubilees deliberately gives Jacob a special status, making him a prototype of the election of Israel, that is contemporary Israel. Simultaneously, as the rejection of Esau is used to distinguish between the two brothers in the story, it is used as an occasion to express a negative attitude towards Gentiles.[73] This tendency is found also when Jubilees in contrast to Genesis introduces Jacob's election, already in the angel's prophecy to Abraham, in which Jacob is made not only a central figure, but also given a higher status:[74]

> "And we told him that all the descendants of his other sons would be Gentiles, and be reckoned with Gentiles, although one of Isaac's sons would become a holy seed, and not be reckoned with the Gentiles: he would become the Most High's portion, and all his descendants settled in that land which belongs to God, so as to be the Lord's special possession, chosen out of all nations, and to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Jub 16,17-18).[75]

Elsewhere it is significant that Gentiles are qualified by negations, such as, not holy peoples, not of God's possession, ruled by angels/demons (cf. Jub 10,8-11). By identifying the outside with what is negative, and by defining its identity in opposition to Israel's identity, rather than in its own right, an evaluation of quality of both sides takes place.

It is further of note that the covenant promise from Exod 19,6 in Jubilees is read back into the election of Jacob, thereby the antiquity of a tradition is stressed.[76]

From this one may conclude that Jubilees contains both the belief that election passes from Jacob to all Israel, and that this limits covenant to contemporary Israel. If Israel's status is one of priority over the Gentiles, this means that by divine decree Gentiles are not chosen; and because they are not chosen, they belong outside the boundaries and must remain outside. This is not the same as denying salvation to Gentiles which

---

[73] Cf. John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.43, "The author clearly denigrated Isaac by portraying Abraham addressing Jacob as his son and also transferring the blessing, the election, and the covenant to him."

[74] For Jacob as a central figure, see Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.99; Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 1960, p.70.
For the idea that Jacob has a higher status, see John C. Endres, Ibid., p.26-28, who demonstrates a clear parallel between Jub 19,21-23 with Gen 13,16, and shows how changes from Genesis to Jubilees point to the status of Jacob as a representative of Israel.

[75] Cf. also Abraham's statement in Jub 19,15-16.

[76] Similar thoughts are expressed in Abraham's blessing of Jacob, cf. Jub 22,10-25.

is not at issue.[77] Rather the issue is, as in the Jacob story, that being elected means to be under obligation to do God's will which again means that election and behaviour are linked. This raises the question, What is the connection between election and behaviour?[78] Is it corporate election and behaviour? Or, is it individual election and behaviour? One way to answer is to look at the election of Levi.

The relation between election and behaviour is emphasized once more in the stories of Levi, interpreting his status as one of priority, because with him an exclusive line of priesthood for Israel begins.[79]

It is of note that Jubilees uses the Genesis story of the rape of Dinah, but changes it by adding the point that Levi is chosen to become priest as a reward for his zeal (Jub 30,18); moreover, that Levi is chosen "to execute righteousness and judgment and vengeance on all those who rose up against Israel" (Jub 30,8).[80] What is important is behaviour, that is right behaviour. Simultaneously as this story serves as an example of an individual's right behaviour it also serves as a warning to contemporary Israel against intermarriage. When individuals break the law against intermarriage it is a threat to the identity of the people by being an attack on Israel's holiness. The wider consequence of Levi's revenge is that a justification for a death sentence in the contemporary society has been provided.[81] A particular emphasis on the collective punishment of this

---

[77] E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, notes that Jacob is central, p.363, but he confuses the issue when he takes the election of Jacob as the basis of salvation, p.368: "*Physical descent is the basis of the election, and the election is the basis of salvation, but physical descent from Jacob is not the sole condition for salvation.*" (Author's own italic.)

[78] See below in (b).

[79] This is different from the Old Testament treatment of the priestly covenant. Here Num 25,10-13 is the occasion for the establishment of a priestly covenant with Phinehas, not Genesis 34, but note the parallel motif of zeal and revenge.
See above in Chapter One, II (4) (a).
The Levites are chosen for all time, on a par with angels, and they are blessed forever. Annie Jaubert, Ibid., p.92, who has noted the parallel to Mal 2,5-6.

[80] John C. Endres, Ibid., p.148-51, points to the Old Testament parallels in Gen 49,5-7 and Deut 33,8-11, as examples of an interpretatory method. The purpose is to explain Levi's priestly status by placing this as far back in past tradition as possible, even when this goes against the Old Testament traditions.
Cf. also his reference, p.152, to Test. Levi. 2-7, which shows that the same set of ideas, particularly revenge, occurs in other Jewish texts of the same period.

[81] Thus, the continuation to this episode with a generalization of the law with a reference to the heavenly tablets (Jub 30,7-17).

offence (Jub 30,15) is worth noting.

Levi's status of priority based on election is seen again in Jub 31,12-20, containing a prophecy about Levi's future priestly task.[82] Thereby Jubilees not only retrojects the priesthood back into the story of the patriarchs, but also uses the election of Levi to point to the contemporary situation and possibly to a future, maybe even a Messianic rule.[83] More importantly, by making Levi the model for an ideal priest, Jubilees makes him the ideal priest who possesses knowledge of the law,[84] an ideal Israelite who has a superior status among other individual Israelites. By thus being made the example for the present Israel with respect to guarding its status, its boundaries of holiness,[85] Levi as an individual is a depiction of zeal for the law.[86]

What these examples show is first of all that for the author of Jubilees there is a conviction that the relationship with God has been narrowed down to a relationship of election, the election to do the will of God. With the interpretation of Jacob as a representative of Israel, Israel's superior status in relation to other nations has been given an explanation.[87] When a distinction of quality is introduced, a distinction between Israel and

---

[82] These tasks are summarized by Klaus Berger, JSHRZ II, 1981, p.475, to be "Vorsteher, Richter, Herscher, Verkündiger des Wortes Gottes, des Gerichtes und Gesetzes. Segnung Israels".
Jub 31,18-20 also contains a prophecy to Judah that he shall be prince to rule over Israel, a rule that will bring the Gentiles to fear Israel's rule, which Berger sums up thus: "Fürst, Furcht der Völker, Hilfe, Heil und Friede".

[83] Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology*, 1971, p.57-66, gives a detailed exegesis of Jub 31,1-32, and warns against reading this passage as a prophecy about a particular messianic figure. The function is not eschatological even if there are some eschatological presuppositions.

[84] Cf. Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.92, who takes the point that Levi alone possesses books, as a reference to the authority of the Levites as interpreters of the law, thus to a possession of knowledge that no other tribe has (cf. also the Dead Sea Scrolls).

[85] The superior status of Levi has a background in the special holiness of the priests, cf. Annie Jaubert, Ibid., p.99-100.

[86] John C. Endres, Ibid., p.160-61, notes both that the role of teaching and preaching makes Levi a symbol of reformed priesthood, and in this portrait he finds evidence for a non-sectarian background of Jubilees, p.242.
He further notes the detail that Jacob offers Levi as a tithe of his sons, (Jub 32,3), which emphasises both that election is to have a special task among the Israelites, p.165, and that tithing is a mark of identity. Thus, by letting Jacob be the example for giving tithes (Jub 32.2.5.8.9), which is authorised as a law of the heavenly tablets, tithing is identified as a mark of identity for the true Israelite, cf. Jub 32,10-15, cf. 13,25-26.

[87] See Jub 19,18. Cf. also the interpretation of the event in which God changes the name of Jacob to Israel, in the course of which Jubilees adds a promise of future dominion of the world (Jub 32,17-19, cf. Gen 35,9-12).

Gentiles is made. Thus the vertical relationship with God has been narrowed down, and it means some are chosen at the expense of the non-chosen. Even if election can be explained and accepted as an *ad hoc* belief, and not as a timeless truth based on a consciousness of inclusiveness in creation, the development shows that separation from the non-chosen becomes a theological necessity.[88] Why does election lead to exclusion?

The justification for exclusion is found in the definition of God. With an image of God as one who elects Israel and simultaneously rejects those who are outside Israel, the demands for exclusion are given a rationale. This further means that for Jubilees the limits for a relationship with God through election become the foundation for setting boundaries, that a boundary to outsiders is set by God, as a dividing line between election and non-election.[89] Therefore, no Gentile is tolerated inside the holy nation, and sharing of meals and intermarriage become key issues. Since covenant identity, election and associated laws and ordinances do not apply outside Israel, Gentiles are a threat to the holiness of Israel.[90] This can be illustrated from Abraham's blessing of Jacob, where the call to separation from Gentiles is both a concrete demand not to eat with them, and not to imitate their rites. Although the context contains a passage on covenant, it is election that is used as a rationale for the demand to separate, hence election stands for exclusion.

> "May (God) renew his covenant with you that you may be to him a people of his own possession always, and that he may be to you and yours a God in truth and righteousness as long as the earth shall last. And do you, Jacob my son, remember my words, and observe the commandments of your father Abraham. Keep yourself separate from the nations, and do not eat with them; and do not imitate their rites, nor associate yourself with them, for their rites are uncleanness, and all their practices polluted, an abomination and unclean. They offer their sacrifices to the dead, and

---

[88] This builds on Old Testament laws of separation between clean and unclean, whether in contrast to Gentiles, or in the sense of setting apart for a special service, such as priesthood, or in the sense of being excluded from the community. See Benedikt Otzen, *TDOT* II, 1975, p.1-3. But when interpreted in an extreme sense, it creates boundaries within the nation.

[89] Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität*, 1982, p.22, takes Jub 2,19 as a central passage for the demand for separation, as "Theologie des Verfassers". He notes that the Book of Jubilees takes the issue of separation back to creation, so that separation is both a divine command and divine created order, being initiated in and from God. Cf. also his treatment of Jub 2,19, p.86-88.

[90] Cf. Eberhard Schwarz, Ibid., who analyses Jubilees from the point of view of holiness and summarises Jubilees' position, p.97: "Weil Jahwe, der Gott Israels, ein heiliger Gott ist, der Israel für sich heiligt, deshalb ist Israel heilig und soll sich heilig verhalten".
In a context of election and holiness, Schwarz observes, Ibid., p.89-93, that the election of Israel is an election from, as well as an election to, that means election is for a purpose of being set apart for holiness.

worship demons, and they eat among the graves, yet all their rites are worthless and to no purpose" (Jub 22,15-17).

In this story Jacob has a representative role when receiving the command to separate.[91] Neither mingling with outside nations, nor imitating their customs or practices, is tolerated. The boundary is clearly set to mark holy and clean from unclean, both for the individual and the nation. Therefore, crossing a boundary from outside is neither possible, nor desirable. This raises the question, Do those within the boundaries of Israel remain inside without conditions?

(b) The primary condition for being identified with election in Jubilees is still birth, although this is narrowed down to being born of the line of Jacob.[92] However, the conditions given to the patriarchs are only used as a foundation, for what is of real concern to the writer. Election is of the whole people, and not just a part of the people. The contemporary identity is based on Israel's exclusive election, and national boundaries need to be set accordingly. But while the exclusiveness of election of the nation is strongly emphasised, election is also for individuals who are called to guard the boundaries, although election is not yet as individualistic or exclusive as in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[93] Who, then, has a right to be within the boundaries?

The right to be within the boundaries is part of the overall issue of behaviour as a reason for exclusion. A brief exposition will suffice. Again, Jubilees demonstrates its position from the Old Testament traditions. Thus, individuals such as Enoch,[94] Noah,[95] Abraham[96] and above all Jacob[97] are clearly inside the boundaries, because of their qualifications, as righteous; hence they serve as models for behaviour in the community which Jubilees addresses. The re-use of the Old Testament stories focuses on these figures as timeless examples, whereby Jubilees provides prototypes for observing the

---

[91] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.363.
Or as John C. Endres, *Interpretation*, 1987, p.229, formulates it, "his (Jacob's) task is to establish Israel's distinctiveness from the Gentiles".

[92] Not Abraham on whom Paul builds his argument, in e.g. Gal 3,29; 4,28.31.

[93] See below in Chapters Three and Four.

[94] Jub 10,17.

[95] Jub 5,19; 10,17.

[96] Jub 11,5-12,27; 17,15-18; 18,16; 23,10.

[97] Jub 27,17; 35,12. Jacob is given the epithet "plant of righteousness", Jub 16,26; 21,24; 22,11; 33,19-20 and in 36,6 this applies to all Israel. See E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.363.

law.[98] And even when the record of such behaviour is idealised, the purpose is not only to set up models of general behaviour for the present community, but also to define who the contemporary righteous are, to claim who have a right to belong, be within the boundaries, and who can be excluded and on what grounds. Those who do not qualify as righteous can be classified by their misbehaviour and be excluded from election.

As in the Old Testament, righteousness is associated with "social, ethical and religious behaviour".[99] In general righteousness for human behaviour in Jubilees may be equated with "perfect or nearly perfect obedience".[100] Although Jubilees once more draws on individuals of the past, such as Noah,[101] Abraham[102] or the people,[103] the generalisation that takes place is not in abstract but in concrete terms.[104] Thus boundaries too are defined in concrete terms, so that righteousness applies to behaviour, is visible in observance of social, ethical and ritual prescriptions, and above all in concrete and visible obedience to the Mosaic law, all with a view to contemporary society. Concrete righteousness is to love neighbours,[105] to keep the Sabbath[106] to keep the law of circumcision,[107] not to consume blood,[108] to observe cultic rules,[109] and to avoid fornication, nakedness and uncleanness, all aimed at individual behaviour.[110] The underlying assumption is that those who in the present society observe these laws can be called righteous, qualify for holiness and are inside the boundaries. While unrighteousness brings

---

[98] Similarly, Leah (Jub 36,23), Rebecca (Jub 25,14) and Joseph (Jub 40,8). For a treatment of the righteous, see E.P. Sanders, Ibid., p.380-81.

[99] Walther Eichrodt, *Theology* I, 1961, p.240.

[100] Thus E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.382.
As such it is a reflection of God's will (Jub 22,10) over against unrighteousness and sin (e.g. Jub 7,20; 35,13).

[101] Jub 7,34.

[102] Jub 23,10.

[103] Jub 16,26; 22,10; cf. 21,21.

[104] For the point of concreteness, I refer to Meinrad Limbeck, *Die Ordnung*, 1971, p.81-82. The concrete demands need to be seen against the background of the community in which the fulfilment of the divine demands is conceived as a possible task. This does not mean that the law for Jubilees is a means to reach a salvation (p.82), rather it is grounded in the image of God as mercy who has created life and joy (p.83), seen for instance in the demand to celebrate the Sabbath in joy, Jub 2,21.31; 50,6-13).

[105] Jub 7,20; 20,2.

[106] Jub 2,28.

[107] Jub 20,2-3.

[108] Jub 7,30; 21,6.18.

[109] Jub 21,15.

[110] Jub 7,20; 20,3.

destruction and judgment,[111] righteousness brings blessing,[112] including the social aspects of peace and blessing. So, when Jubilees addresses Israel's identity by appealing to Israel's past righteousness, and uses election to interpret the boundaries, the writer has in mind the present community.[113] From a general theological point of view no one outside Israel can ever qualify as righteous or holy and cross the boundary set by election. But if those inside transgress these laws given divine authority, they not only transgress a command, they cross the boundaries of election. This is indicated by the warning that transgressors become equal to those who are outside election. From this we may conclude that election is not just an abstract idea, a theological basis for identity, but the rationale in a concrete situation where exclusion is a social punishment.

Finally, to be inside the boundaries of election is related to holiness. As in the Old Testament holiness forms a contrast to sin, which stands for lack of participation, for violation of boundaries, for breach of the covenant relationship,[114] for rupture of holiness,[115] for revolt against God, who sets the rules for relationship and judges accordingly. In general, improper ritual and ethical behaviour results in condemnation: death,[116] the wrath of God,[117] to be rooted out of the land,[118] no forgiveness,[119] extinction,[120] all of which amount to exclusion from belonging to Israel, leading to the eschatological judgment. From a theological point of view, destruction is caused by divine anger and judgment, for God is "a righteous God and executes judgment on all who transgress his commandments and despise his covenant" (Jub 21,4). The social implication of this is that God's representative, in the contemporary established cult for instance, has both a right and a duty to execute, punish or exclude from belonging. That these issues are raised and dealt with in the context of an interpretation of Old Testament traditions, points to continuous problems associated with setting and crossing ethical,

---

[111] Jub 21,21-22.

[112] Jub 25,16-18.

[113] Cf. Jub 24,29; 36,6 and 5,12.

[114] Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.415, who prefers the terms "breach" and "violation" of relationships.

[115] Cf. Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.97. Although she does not use the word "sin" in the context of holiness, the meaning seems to be the same.

[116] Jub 2,27 and 50,13.

[117] Jub 15,33-34.

[118] Jub 6,12.35.

[119] Jub 24,28-30 and 36,10.

[120] Jub 49,8-9.

ritual, social and moral boundaries, but it points especially to contemporary struggles over identity and its boundaries. The frequent references to sexual sins and to intermarriage as a sin[121] and to how this is punished[122] illustrate clearly how boundaries relate to a concrete concern for keeping the people holy and free of foreign influence, most importantly free from foreign gods. Since a foreign identity is reflected in different boundaries, such as laws on sexual behaviour, the wider perspective is that of boundaries related to holiness.[123] Even if the immediate aim of Jubilees is to preserve the present nation in its holiness by guarding its internal and external boundaries,[124] the wider consequence of this is that Israel must prevent Gentiles from entering, so as not to defile Israel's holiness, or make Israelites become like Gentiles. For the Jews to act like Gentiles is the same as to be outside the boundaries of God's holy people and it means loss of identity. Hence Jubilees cannot envisage Gentiles crossing the boundary, ethnic as well as religious, to Israel. Because such a crossing is inconceivable, therefore a rite marking entry from outside is not yet created.

In sum, when boundaries are defined theologically, by election, belonging is theologically restricted. And when identity is defined not only by birth but also by proper behaviour, belonging is a matter of quality and boundaries are set to exclude on grounds of quality of behaviour. With a theology of election an antithetic division between inside and outside has been established, and this leads to social implications, to exclusion. The principle is that Israel must remain in a state of holiness, and that since holiness does not apply outside election, boundaries are needed. In practice, Israel is called to respond to the general warning against mixing with foreigners, to set external boundaries. In order to maintain the exclusive status of being the elect people of God, separation serves to exclude Gentiles. And in order to keep Israel in its status as elect

---

[121] E.g. incest in Jub 33,10; 45,25. Or the when story of Dinah, Jub 30,11, cf. 35,14, is used to introduce a general prohibition against giving daughters to Gentiles, or accepting foreign women.

[122] Cf. Jub 20,4 and 25,1-3.

[123] The origin is possibly old with a background in the fertility cults of Israel's neighbours. Cf. Foster R. McCurly, *Ancient Myth*, 1983.

[124] The same aim of holiness is indicated in the general prohibition against fornication and uncleanness in Jub 16,5-6 (cf. 25,7 and 50,5), and in the general prohibitions against incest (based on Jub 33,18-20 Reuben and Bilhah and 41,26 Judah and Tamar).
The tendency to exclude foreigners by prohibiting intermarriage has a background in the Old Testament, especially in the context of Ezra and Nehemiah (e.g. Ezra 9-10), which is in conflict with a different praxis in for instance the Book of Ruth.

internal boundaries of behaviour function to distinguish behaviour within the boundaries. Since these are set for the sake of protecting Israel's own holiness, or for the sake of distinguishing the righteous from the unrighteous, explicit signs that mark inclusion are also needed. The most important sign of this is circumcision.

(2) Circumcision: Rite of Affirmation?

Thus far I have dealt with boundaries mainly from the point of view of separation and exclusion from election. What remains to be looked at is the problem of how Israel affirms its internal boundaries from a ritual point of view. This raises the question whether there is in Jubilees a clear rite that functions as a boundary mark.

For a symbol to qualify as sign of belonging, visibility is vital, because a clear and visible sign of belonging, taking the form of an act of confession, or a rite of affirmation of belonging, is the obvious way to express what status one has within a group or society. In the context of Jubilees this visibility can be found particularly in circumcision, and to a certain degree in the celebration of festivals, either the weekly Sabbath or the yearly, seasonal feasts, which function as affirmation of identity. I shall concentrate here on the rite of circumcision for two reasons: first, from a wider socio-religious perspective, or a phenomenological point of view circumcision is parallel to baptism; and secondly, from a theological point of view circumcision is related to covenant consciousness. According to Jub 15,11-34 male circumcision is a rite of the covenant, which raises the question, Is circumcision then a boundary rite? If it is, what does circumcision stand for? Crossing a boundary by means of an initiation? or affirmation?

First, Jubilees assumes that the rite has a divine origin, because it uses the Old Testament tradition and refers to it as a sign given by God to Israel; hence a sign that has eternal validity.[125] But since scripture is open to different interpretations, including the possibility that circumcision may be a spiritual circumcision, as in Jub 1,23, this is not in itself sufficient reason for it to play the role of boundary marker.[126] It is significant that Jubilees 15 retells Genesis 17 and interprets it with a particular purpose of answering a contemporary boundary problem. Unlike Genesis, where circumcision is a sign of obedience, but not a sign on which the

---

[125] See Jub 15,11, compared to Gen 17,13.

[126] The spiritualization (cf. Deut 10,16; 30,6; Jer 4,4) is referred to in Jub 1,23 in a prophetic passage on future covenant relationship reestablished by God. But apart from this passage, this idea is not emphasised in Jubilees.

covenant rests,[127] Jubilees makes circumcision the sign on which the covenant relationship rests, by adding eternal validity in making it a law written on heavenly tablets (Jub 15, 25-34). Further, in comparison with Genesis, where those who neglect circumcision are merely cut off from the people for breaking the covenant (Gen 17,14), Jubilees sharpens the demand to cut off by threatening with extinction from the earth, or exclusion from forgiveness (Jub 15,26.28.34).[128] This means not only that a neglect has more severe consequences in relation to horizontal covenantal belonging, but also in relation to a vertical relationship and to salvation.

Secondly, when Jubilees calls those inside "children of the covenant" and distinguishes this group from those outside who are called "children of destruction" (Jub 15,26), it refers to circumcision in its function as a rite of identification. Thus circumcision is used to mark who belong to God's covenant as opposed to those who do not, since circumcision is a mark of one's status. When practised it serves as a clear indication that birth is not a sufficient criterion for belonging, but that an additional qualification is needed, as in Jub 15,26:

> "Every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, does not belong among the sons of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but is marked out for destruction".

Circumcision is for the writer of Jubilees a visible mark of covenant belonging, because it serves as the most important symbol for membership of the covenant people, the symbol that ensures a continuation of Israel's elect status, the sign that unites the people socially.[129] Moreover, from inside the people circumcision has a dividing role, when it clearly functions as a concrete affirmation of being born within the covenant, rather than as an entry rite.

Thirdly, circumcision is in Jubilees a symbol by means of which God's holiness is made present (cf.2,19), because it serves as a sign by means of

---

[127] See Chapter One, II (2) (a) where I demonstrated that Gen 17 belongs to the promissory category.

[128] See e.g. Jub 15,34: no forgiveness will be obtained, "not even in eternity".

[129] The conflict under Antiochus IV especially gave rise to the confessional function, cf. 1 Macc 1,48.60-61; 2,46; 2 Macc 6,10. Cf. Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.717. Whether this conflict is a background also for Jubilees is a matter of debate, cf. note 2 above.
Thus, Klaus Berger, JSHRZ II, 1981, p.405, sees circumcision as sign of the covenant, and as sign of belonging (Gemeinschaft), but adds the apotropaic aspect which he bases on Jub 15,31-32. Even if this is a possible interpretation, it seems better to take this in a context of warning if circumcision is not practised.

which the boundary to holiness was and is marked. This is the case with angels, who by definition belong to the order of heaven, to perfection, and who, by implication, are circumcised beings.[130] So when circumcision is practised, the boundary between human imperfection and divine perfection is crossed. As a sign of participation in the order of heaven, the rite is believed to have the power to confer the status of holiness, and thus it functions also as an eschatological symbol.[131] Moreover, it functions as a mark of holiness, not in an abstract sense, but in concrete form as a boundary between belonging to holiness and not belonging. In this respect circumcision sets a dividing line between inside and outside God's covenant with the holy people, a mark that divides not just Israel from Gentiles, but holy and perfect from imperfect.

In the above mentioned cases, circumcision needs to be seen from both a vertical and horizontal perspective.

From the vertical perspective, circumcision is seen as a divine command, a covenant law, God's gift to Israel, as a covenant mark for the people as a token of Israel's share in the divine sphere. From a horizontal perspective, circumcision is a human response, by means of which the individual accepts a share in the life and goal of the community. In both perspectives circumcision is a boundary mark, and a symbol of inclusion as well as of exclusion. With respect to both the divine sphere and the human community circumcision is a boundary mark. This is clear from the fact that Jubilees associates failure to be circumcised with destruction as well as with loss of identity (Jub 15,28-30); and it is clear from the fact that Jubilees associates circumcision with separation.[132] In short, if Israel disregards circumcision, the divine law and order is broken, with the result that the special relationship with God is cut off, so that the status of holiness ceases to exist. Simultaneously the status of belonging to Israel as a people is made impossible. Thus, circumcision as a boundary mark has a

---

[130] I use "perfection" here as a term for holiness, deriving from the idea that angels according to Jub 15,27 are created circumcised, thus perfect creatures, cf. R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1902, p.lxxxiv, and Bent Noack, Jubilæerbogen, p.229.
A parallel tradition is found in Pseudo-Philo 9,13.15, where Moses is born circumcised. "The covenant of the flesh" designates his special status.
This points forward to the role of circumcision particularly in Galatians. See below in Chapter Seven, II.

[131] Although Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität*, 1982, p.88, does not use the term "perfection", he points to the fact that angels play a special role both in connection to the celebration of Sabbath and to circumcision. This makes Sabbath and circumcision part of the order of heaven, and by accepting these, Israel belongs to the divine sphere, "göttlichen Bereich".

[132] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.365; Eberhard Schwarz, Ibid., 1982, p.88.

double function: it marks holiness, and it sets the external boundary of the community that believes itself to be in a covenant relationship.

Does it follow that all those who accept circumcision automatically belong to God's covenant? The answer to this question is negative, precisely because circumcision is not a rite of entry, but of affirmation. I propose therefore that the reason why Jubilees did not mention that the Shechemites underwent circumcision in Jub 30, is that the author does not recognize circumcision as valid when practised outside Israel. When practised by outsiders like the Shechemites it is neither a sign of social belonging, nor of crossing a boundary between Gentiles and Israel, nor is it a means of reaching holiness and perfection.

Even if the context of Jub 15 is taken as a polemical attack on contemporary disregard of circumcision, it is clear that the demand for circumcision applies only to those who are born within the covenant, those already inside the ethnic boundaries.[133] It is nowhere stated that circumcision is the way to enter the covenant, because that would leave a possibility that those who were born outside the covenant could enter it; or even those outside the line of Abraham and Jacob - that is, outside election. Eventually this would undermine the division between inside and outside God's covenant and election. Even though all the other sons of Abraham are circumcised, they are not therefore part of the elect, or of the covenant. The divine command to circumcise is neither a gift nor an obligation outside the boundaries of the covenant, nor is it the means of entry to the covenant, because it is a boundary mark of the already existing covenant. Covenant identity is God-given and is reflected in its ritual boundaries, particularly when circumcision affirms a God-given ethnic identity.

Although circumcision is a male rite, and ancient Judaism is a male-dominated world, the question arises whether women, to whom circumcision does not apply, need to affirm their ethnic identity. How do women come to the status of belonging? Although women are not addressed in the command to circumcise or to keep the covenant,[134] they are, nevertheless, classified as born within the covenant. Thus there is a clear distinction between women who belong by birth and those who do not belong, which can be illustrated from Jub 25,1-10 (cf. 22,20) where Rebecca warns Jacob not to marry a daughter of Canaan, and asks him specifically to choose a woman within the

---

[133] Cf. Eberhard Schwarz, Ibid., 1982, p.104.

[134] The command to circumcise is a command to the father to act on his sons and slaves, cf. Gen 17,25.27; 21,4. When Abraham obeys the command this effects God's blessing (promise of posterity), not entrance to the covenant.

family (25,3). The conclusion concerning women is that the same requirements of birth apply.

Unlike the command of male circumcision, no similar demand is given to women to affirm their belonging. Rather, birth alone suffices. The demand for purification after childbirth (Jub 3,8-11) can be classified as a command which serves to set Israel apart from Gentiles, but it serves the different purpose of maintaining identity, rather than affirming it.[135] Rooted as this command is in the creation story it is given a high authority, equal to that given to the Sabbath. However, nowhere in Jubilees is this ritual set in a context of affirmation, so it is perhaps too much to conclude that it functions as a purity rite reflecting covenantal identity.

In sum. Having looked at circumcision in the context of identity and boundaries, I conclude that it had no function as a rite of initiation. In a civil-religious society, such as Israel was at the time when Jubilees was written, circumcision had other functions. On the one hand, Israel's identity was, as in the Old Testament, defined in ethnic categories, so that boundaries were set along ethnic-geographical lines. On the other hand, Israel's identity was defined in religious categories, a people belonging to God, so that boundaries needed to be defined along socio-religious lines. Thus, because circumcision functioned as affirmation of covenant identity, it was a boundary mark which when practised separated the elect children of Israel from the non-elect, the Gentiles. Because it functioned as a sign of holiness, it marked a boundary of the sphere of heaven, an of holiness. Because it functioned as mark of identification, it served as a boundary to separate right and wrong behaviour within Israel.

III Conclusion.

It is noteworthy that Jubilees lacks criticism of contemporary religious structures. The established cult is accepted; the present temple is a valid means for atonement and moreover serves as an important centre for holiness and for social and religious identity. Because Jerusalem is a centre of shared identity, it unites the nation and helps to maintain the social structure, and as such it is not questioned.

A covenant consciousness is recalled in the retold stories of past relationships, in the covenants with Noah, Abraham, Jacob and Moses, with a particular focus on the double promise of land and people, tied to covenant obligations. These stories are reinterpreted in Jubilees with the purpose of

---

[135] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.364.

conveying a message to contemporary readers, taking the form of an interpretation of the law as revelation, as divine order. In halakhic form the author employs traditional law and addresses contemporary transgression, including an apocalyptic message of judgment, for the sake of retaining identity and protecting the boundaries from outside and inside threats. One risk is that foreign belief and customs are imposed by law, a danger that is met with a warning not to accept a Gentile life-style. Another risk is that a less strict interpretation of law may be attempted from within the nation. To this Jubilees' answer is to present a reinterpretation of tradition by retrojecting laws and customs as far back as possible, rather than proclaiming a new revelation, such as prophecy or an apocalyptic message addressing the same problems. The former is chosen by the author of Jubilees, in the same way as the Deuteronomist chose to reinterpret the law.

When identity is tied to the theology of election, or exclusion, boundaries too are exclusive. This means that God's covenant is narrowed down to a particularistic understanding of Israel as elect, that Israel stands as a nation distinct from the Gentile world. This results in a demand for separation.

In the context that the story told in Jubilees is an interpretation of the past for contemporary readers, its most important message is that the holiness of the land and people must be guarded in order to preserve Israel's present identity, its special status over other nations, and also to keep the nation and community united against foreign influence. More specific in the identity crisis is circumcision, since this stands out now as the important and decisive mark of identity. Simultaneously it serves as a symbol of affirmation of the covenant, a mark of both the internal and external boundary, of national, social and religious belonging, and of inclusion and exclusion of election.

Although Jubilees clearly has the future integrity of Israel in mind, it is noteworthy that new covenant is not found. Basically, there is one covenant, eternally established and valid. The hope for a restoration of Israel's relationship with God has its origin in creation and concerns the future. The eternal covenant is envisaged as a covenant to be fully realised when Israel will be the holy people it has been elected to be, a nation that lives in truth and righteousness. The goal is to become the place for God's manifestation in Jerusalem, to guarantee God's presence within the boundaries of the land of Israel. Since Gentiles by definition are outside the boundaries set by God's election, the demarcation line between Israel and all other peoples of the world is a boundary that must be respected. By

divine decree contact across the boundaries of holiness is not permitted; the demarcation line between Israel and all other peoples is a boundary that must be respected.

I conclude that for Jubilees boundaries reflect identity in three ways. (a) Identity defined by birth creates ethnic boundaries. (b) Identity defined by election and behaviour has righteousness as a goal and creates ethical boundaries that mark the line between inside and outside. (c) Identity defined by holiness calls for boundaries to be marked ritually. An affirmation of Israel's social identity takes place in Jubilees when individuals accept circumcision as the most important symbol of belonging. Therefore, rejection of circumcision is a breach of both the vertical and the horizontal covenant, which has extinction as its severe consequence. When individuals become like Gentiles, Israel's identity is endangered; indeed it is lost. Alternatively, performing the rite solidifies both internal and external boundaries.

CHAPTER THREE

COVENANT CONDITIONS AND RITUAL BOUNDARIES IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL AND THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT.

In this chapter I shall group 11QTemple and CD together, because they are closely related, at least on some issues.[1] As we shall see, the relatively few occurrences of the covenant term in 11QTemple and the more frequent and nuanced use of the term in CD are in some cases close to Jubilees, in others the ideas point forward to 1QS. Before I treat Identity, in Section I, and Boundaries, in Section II, a few general remarks on the two texts in order to recall briefly their overall purpose and goal, and to explain what their general context within Judaism in antiquity is.

When the Temple Scroll was first published in 1977[2] subsequent translations and studies interpreted it as "Essene" and from the time of John Hyrcanus, its origin being the "Qumran community";[3] however, both origin[4] and date[5]

---

[1] Thus there are close parallels in the legal material, such as the laws against polygamy or divorce and against marriage between uncle and niece, in CD 5,7-8 and 11QTemple and 66,15-17, or the prohibition against sexual intercourse in the holy temple city, in CD 12,1-2 and 11QTemple 45,11-12.
Cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* I, 1983, p.301-4; Philip R. Davies, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 1989, p.201-10, who think CD refers to and uses 11QTemple; Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, esp. p.139-47 and *JNES* 49, 1990, esp. p.156-57. He thinks 11QTemple applies CD's community laws to the whole people, and that 11QTemple builds on CD.

[2] The first edition was the Hebrew edition in 1977, by Yigael Yadin; appeared in 1983 an Hebrew-English edition, *The Temple Scroll*, I-III. Unless otherwise stated, translations follow Yadin.

[3] For translations see, Johann Maier; G. Vermes; Hans-Aage Minky On "Essene" origin see, Yigael Yadin and Johann Maier, and Emil Schürer, *History* III.1, 1986, p.380-420 (revised by Geza Vermes); Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scroll. Qumran in Perspective*, 1977.1982. See also the studies by Hans-Aage Mink, and Jacob Milgrom, Wayne O. McCready, cf. my bibliography, part IV.
For a history of research I refer to Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, p.1-34.

[4] Based on linguistic and doctrinal grounds Lawrence H. Schiffman and Hartmut Stegemann argues for a "non-sectarian" background and an origin outside "the Qumran community". For their studies, see my bibliography, especially the recent article in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 1989. See also Michael Owen Wise, Ibid., esp. chapter 7.

[5] The problem of date is equally disputed; for a summary of the problem see, Emil Schürer, *History* III.1, 1986, p.415-17 in which Vermes opts for a date around 200 BC.
An early date, 4th or 3rd century BC, has been suggested by Hartmut Stegemann; early, but not before 200 BC is the view of Phillip R. Callaway; if 11QTemple is earlier than CD, then ca. 150 BC is a possibility, as argued by Torleif Elgvin, *JJS* 36, 1985, p.103-6; E.M. Laperrousaz, *DB Supp* 9, col.745-98, suggests the time of Alexander Jamnaeus, 103-76 BC, which is also suggested by M. Hengel, J.H. Charlesworth and D. Mendels, *JJS* 37, 1986, p.28-38. A Herodian dating, 37-4 BC, is adventured by Barbara Thiering, in

have since been questioned. In content 11QTemple depends on the Old Testament background and is also close to the Book of Jubilees.[6] There is no scholarly consensus as to its genre.[7] Like Jubilees, the Temple Scroll is either a divine revelation, in which God speaks directly to Moses as a representative of the people;[8] or it is a reinterpretation or elaboration of Old Testament legal material, a reinforcement and supplement to the laws in Exodus 34-40 and Deuteronomy 12,1-23,1.[9] Whether 11QTemple is polemical and speaks against an impure temple and an invalid cult by referring to an eschatological replacement, or claims the authority of temple and cult for its own community by retrojecting the prescriptions for cultic holiness back to the Old Testament, is a matter to which I shall return. I concur with the view that 11QTemple envisages both an eschatological ideal temple and a real one. The present building is to function until the messianic age when the eschatological temple will replace it.[10] From a holistic perspective, the redactor of 11QTemple addresses the issue of the validity of the temple and its sacrifices for all Israel, and expresses concern for the holiness of the people and the land in which the temple is the centre. Thus, from the point

---

Temple Scroll Studies, 1989, p.99-120. The majority accepts the arguments for the time of John Hyrcanus, 135-104 BC, thus Yigael Yadin, Jacob Milgrom and Hans-Aage Mink, cf. my bibliography.
For a full discussion of this problem I refer to Michael Owen Wise, ibid., who argues for the date 150 based on a parallel between 11QTemple and 1 Macc 10, 34-35.

[6] For the relationship to the Book of Jubilees, see James C. VanderKam, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 1989, p.211-36. He deals particularly with the problem of a 364-day solar calendar, the number of Festivals, and the role of the temple, and concludes that the two authors seem to draw on the same cultic and exegetical tradition, although they disagree about some details.

[7] For a detailed discussion of both purpose and date, again I refer to Michael Owen Wise, Ibid., esp. chapter 6. Based on a redactional study of the sources, he divides the text into four major sources, and he concludes that the redactor intended 11QTemple to be "an eschatological law for the land", p.155.

[8] Although the name Moses does not appear in the text as preserved, it may be inferred from the context, particularly 11QTemple 44,5. See Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll. The Hidden Law*, 1985, p.64-74 and Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle*, 1978, p.13. For a summary of the content, see Emil Schürer, *History* III.1, 1986, p.407-11.

[9] E.g. Hartmut Stegemann, in *Das Land*, 1983, p.162, takes 11QTemple as a law supplementing Deuteronomy.
Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle*, 1978, p.12-13, suggests that the concern for 11QTemple is to set up a program for building a centre of holiness from the temple and outwards, hence the title, "Holiness Scroll".
For further details I refer to Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, esp. chapter 6.

[10] For the two temples, See Hans-Aage Mink, *DTT* 42, 1979, p.111; Lawrence Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 1983, p.13-14; Hermann Lichtenberger, in *Approaches* II, 1980, p.164-67; Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* I, 1983, p.182-87.

of view of identity, it addresses the whole people, not just a group within it as in 1QS. The temple is symbol of a covenant relationship between all Israel and its God, and it takes holiness as its goal.

The Damascus Document was first published in 1910[11] and before the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls it was assigned to a variety of groups in Judaism in antiquity;[12] its fragmentary nature with a mixture of legal and homiletic material was acknowledged;[13] but since these discoveries most scholars acknowledge an Essene background.[14] Its place of origin and its composite nature as well as its purpose are issues of an ongoing debate.[15]

---

[11] A manuscript was found in 1896 in Cairo and published in 1910 by Salomo Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Volume I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge 1910. Fragments were found in the Qumran caves 4, 5, and 6, not yet published, which seem to be close to the Cairo text. See J.T. Milik, *Ten Years*, 1959, p.58. 114. 116-18. 151-2; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1977, p.90-91.
The editions of texts and selections of translations I have used are by Flemming Friis Hvidberg; Leonhard Rost; Chaim Rabin; Eduard Lohse and Philip R. Davies, see my bibliography, part I.
Unless otherwise stated the quotations are from the edition of Rabin.

[12] For these groups and their identity, see Philipp Seidensticker, *SBFLA* 9, 1958/59, p.94-198; Christopher Rowland, *Christian Origins*, 1985, p.68-80.

[13] Thus, the distinction between text A and text B. Traditionally, CD is divided into two parts, an exhortation in the form of a sermon, 1,1-8,21 and 19,1-20,34; a collection of laws, 9,1-16,19. For a summary of the content, see e.g. Emil Schürer, *History* III.1, 1986, p.389-92.

[14] Interestingly, the Essene background was generally ignored before the Dead Sea Scrolls were found, see for instance Leonhard Rost, *Die Damaskusschrift*, 1933, p.4.
For a history of research, both before and after the connection to the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, p.3-47.
For a general overview with special emphasis on historical development, see Phillip R. Callaway, *History*, 1988, p.89-133.
Regarding the date, most scholars agree on a date between 150 BC and 50 BC. However, a date prior to the settlement at the Qumran site has been advocated by Philip R. Davies, who operates with three stages of development, cf. *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983.

[15] Thus, Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*, 1971, esp. p.128-85, who concludes that CD is a historical account of the conflicts within the Qumran community. In a number of articles, J.Murphy-O'Connor, argues for a pre-Qumran setting and for the composite nature of CD, the core of which is 2,14-6,1 which he designates "a missionary document", see *RB* 77, 1970, p.201-29; *RB* 78, 1971, p.210-32; *RB* 79, 1972, p.200-216; *RB* 79, 1972, p.544-64; *RB* 92, 1985, p.223-46. Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, likewise suggests a pre-Qumranian background, and based on literary studies he divides the text into four main sections, History, Laws, Warnings (CD 1,1-8,19) and the New Covenant (CD 19,33b-20,34). However, by ignoring the legal material in CD 9-16, he fails to explain the importance of the legal material and seems to overlook that covenant is identified with law. Further debate is found in his *Behind the Essenes*, 1987. Both Davies and Murphy-O'Connor agree on the composite nature of CD, although they are not in complete agreement on how to identify the sources of the document. Both offer valuable contributions with important insights.

Given the scope of the present study I shall not attempt to enter this debate, but will look at CD in its present form as an example of a homiletic and/or catechetical interpretation of historical and legal material from the Old Testament, pointing to the use of covenant terminology to draw some conclusions on identity and boundaries. Whatever the background, it is immediately clear to the reader that in its present form CD addresses a narrower audience than the Temple Scroll. Thus, when CD in the opening paragraph begins, "And now listen, all who know righteousness, and understand the dealings of God" (CD 1,1-2),[16] this is not an address to the people, or to all Israel, but to the few, to those who understand themselves to be the "remnant" which God has raised (cf. CD 1,5-8). This address to insiders is conspicuous, and immediately raises the question of identity, whether the group is in opposition to the establishment or to a more widely defined Judaism, and what the identity of the CD community is. The decisive answer to this will be given only when the question of where the boundaries are set is answered.

Since the document was first published it has been studied with reference to the term covenant, both as a term of theological importance and as a term designating the community in which CD originated. Already Ernst Lohmeyer[17] in his exposition of the covenant notion pointed to the difficulty in understanding the meaning of the covenant concept as well as to the uncertainty in the use of the term. In spite of continuous and additional research since then, his reservation (p.116) is still worth bearing in mind.

I. Covenantal Identity.

As in the Old Testament and Jubilees ברית stands in CD and 11QTemple for a relationship with God in the past, present and future, and simultaneously functions as a term for belonging to a community. Its more frequent use in CD,[18] as well as its less frequent use in 11QTemple,[19] carries the Old Testament meaning. In general covenantal belonging is defined according to a more particularistic self-understanding. The question is, Who belongs to the covenant? the whole people of Israel? or part of the people? First I shall

---

[16] Translation of P.Davies.

[17] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.115-121.

[18] Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 1960, p.37, enumerates 42 occurrences: CD 1,4.17.18.20; 2,2; 3,4.10.11.13; 4,9; 5,12; 6,2.11.19; 7,5; 8,1.18.21; 9,3; 10,6; 12,11; 13,14; 14,2; 15,2.3.5.6.8.9; 16,1.12; 19,1.13.14.16.31.33; 20,12(twice).17.25.29 - found in both the legal and homiletic parts of CD.

[19] According to Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, III, 1983, p.437, there are 5 occurrences: 2,4 (citing Exod 34,12); 20,14 (covenant of salt); 29,10 on festival laws on sacrifices; 55,17 on laws against idolatry; and 59,8 as part of the laws concerning the royal authority.

demonstrate that although the belief in the covenant rests on the idea that God is guarantor of covenant relationship, the human partner is under specific obligations and thereby the covenant becomes a narrower category than in the Old Testament. Secondly, I will attempt to show that if obedience is the focal point of covenant relationship, then the idea of holiness changes from a quality derived from God's presence, to one related to human actions. Finally, I shall address the issues of a broken covenant and who belong to the "new covenant".

(1) Conditions for Covenant Validity.

Although covenant validity, as in the Old Testament, derives primarily from the covenant having been established by God, the tendency to see validity as dependent on human response is also clear.

(a) Essentially, for both 11QTemple and CD, the covenant has its origin in God, in whose nature and will it is grounded, and on whose faithfulness covenant-validity rests.[20] This is seen in the uses of qualifying adjuncts to the covenant, as a "covenant of God": בריתי;[23] בריתו;[22] בריתי אל;[21] indicating that the covenant is valid even without human partners.[24] When the texts refer to a human partner, they also equate belonging to the covenant with being subject to conditions,[25] and thus identify covenant with law.[26] Both 11QTemple and CD presuppose the Old Testament idea of one covenant, although different covenantal manifestations may be referred to, as we shall see. So, even if the covenant in the Old Testament in principle stands for a God-given relationship to Israel, the reception shows that in practice covenant is read as having law as its content. Thus, the tendency to make the law,

---

[20] The faithfulness of God is further found in the expression that God keeps the covenant oath. E.g. CD 8,15 and 19,28.

[21] CD 3,11; 5,12; 7,5; 13,14; 14,2; 20,17.

[22] CD 1,17; 3,13; 8,1; 19,3.

[23] 11QTemple 55,7; 59,8.

[24] Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.117.
For the establishment of the covenant the verbal expression for God's act is in CD הקים, in 11QTemple כרת, cf. CD 3,12; 4,9 and 11QTemple 29,10. נתן is not used.

[25] Cf. the use of ל to qualify the covenant in CD 3,13 and 4,9 which is a preposition for a relationship given by a superior to an inferior partner. See, M. Weinfeld, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.788; and Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.117.

[26] CD's treatment of the law is by implication an allusion to the covenant of Sinai. See Ernst Lohmeyer, Ibid., p.117 and Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.555-594, esp. p.561.
11QTemple with its elaboration of Old Testament legal material presupposes an obligatory covenant.

not the covenant, the leading principle is clear in these texts.[27] Covenant validity is not only tied to God's promise but is also conditional on keeping the law.

(b) As in the Old Testament, covenant in CD concerns the people's relationship to God, is a "covenant with all Israel", ברית לישראל;[28] ברית לכל ישראל;[29] ברית ועם כל ישראל.[30] These expressions show an awareness of continuity, particularly with Sinai, the event in which the people was born. Essentially these expressions contain the idea that God's covenant is for the whole people of Israel. But from the contexts in which they are used, a change in emphasis can be observed in so far as covenant entails response, or covenant is conditional on keeping the law. In practice, the covenant covers only those who can be said to observe the law. Thus we find the same tendency as in the Book of Jubilees, to narrow down covenantal belonging to a restricted membership, based on ethics.[31] As a result of the emphasis on obedience rather than on ethnic belonging, a narrower identity with narrower boundaries has emerged.

(c) The validity of the covenant builds, as in the Old Testament, on the belief that covenant relationship is a relationship established by God in the past and seen as a permanent relationship, hence the adjective "eternal" with covenant. The expression "eternal covenant" is not used in the Temple Scroll; instead we find eternal is adjunct to ordinances/statutes, חוקות.[32] This is significant because it again shows a clear tendency to make the law the key principle for the relationship. Probably the covenant in its eternal validity is implied in 11QTemple 59,17, containing a promise of a future, eternal kingdom of Israel and a king chosen by God, thus drawing on the promissory aspect of the Davidic covenant.[33] In the context of 11QTemple God's promise of the kingdom is valid provided the king walks in the statutes of God. This changes the emphasis of the covenant's validity in so far as the Old Testament promise to David of an eternal dynasty is now

---

[27] Thus Ernst Lohmeyer, Ibid., p.117, points to the meaning of covenant as divine will, "göttliche Willensäßerung", which incorporates both promise and law. See also Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism*, 1990, p.72.

[28] CD 3,13; cf. 15,8-9.

[29] CD 15,5.

[30] CD 16,1.

[31] Already Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.119, pointed to the shift in CD from national to ethical belonging to Israel.

[32] 11QTemple 18,8; 19,8; 22,14; 25,8; 27,4. Cf. Lev 23,31.

[33] See my treatment of 2 Sam 7,12-13 above in Chapter One II (2) (b). 11QTemple is closer to Ps 132,12 than to 2 Sam 7.

conditional on obedience to the law. It further points to a development into an ideology in which covenant is almost synonymous with statutes and covenant validity tied to obedience.

In CD "eternal covenant", ברית לעולם is used twice.[34] Thus, CD 3,12-14 clearly states what is meant by "eternal covenant",

> "But with them that held fast with the commandments of God who were left over of them, God established[35] His covenant with Israel even until eternity, by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel has gone astray".

Two things are expressed here: one, that because the covenant is established by God, it has eternal validity, and two, that God's covenant is with those who have kept the commandments. This means that the covenant has a limited validity and concerns only a part of Israel. While CD presupposes the covenant stories about Noah (Gen 9) and Abraham (Gen 17), it also narrows covenant down by letting legal observance be a condition for the validity of the relationship. As in 11QTemple 59,17, the leading principle is law, not covenant.

(d) As in the Old Testament, validity is for CD based on the belief that God is known as one who "remembers" the covenant, or the "covenant of ancestors";[36] זכר is in CD 1,4 and 6,2 used about God in the context of the covenant.[37] From this we can infer that the validity of the covenant is tied to past events, to what was revealed to Israel about its relationship to God. Although we find that the covenant has a historical dimension, there is an awareness of its being related to a present community building on the past.[38] This means that the existence, duration and validity of covenant relationship must be presupposed, so that past validity extends into the present because of God's act of remembering the covenant. However, the question is, What does it mean that God remembers the covenant?

According to CD 1,4-5, "But when He remembered the covenant of the ancestors, He caused a remnant to remain of Israel and gave them not up to

---

[34] Thus CD 3,4.13. Cf. 15,5: והבא בברית לכל ירשראל לחוק עולם. Note, that for law/ordinances CD uses קדש (20,30) or צדק (20,11; 20,31, 20,33), not עולם.

[35] הקים, cf. 4,9. Same verbal expression in Gen 6,18; 9,9.11; 17,17.21.

[36] CD 1,4: וזכרתי להם ברית ראשנים. This is a quotation from Lev 26,45, from the context of the Sinai covenant in which God remembered the previous covenant relationship as a favour to Israel, hence a reference to validity, cf. also CD 6,2. Parallel is ברית האבות, CD 8,18 and 19,31, cf. Jer 34,13; 31,32 and Deut 9,5 and 7,8.

[37] Cf. Gen 9,15-16; Isa 64,8; Jer 31,34. See above in Chapter One II (1) (a) with reference to H. Eising, *TDOT* IV, 1980, p.70-71.

[38] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.118.

be consumed", God's remembering means mercy not wrath.[39] It is noteworthy that the phrase, ברית האבות, "covenant of the ancestors", occurs in a context of both love and hate, cf. CD 8,18 and 19,31, explaining that those who belong to "the covenant of the fathers" are loved by God, while all who do not obey the law will be the object of the wrath of God. When CD 3,5-12 includes a brief summary of the history of Israel from the exodus to the exile with a special emphasis on Israel's sins, the exile is seen as a result of the wrath of God. Because Israel did not in the past walk according to the law, it was given over to its enemies and punished (cf. CD 1,3-7), and "the land was made desolate" (CD 3,10, cf. 5,20-6,2). The same motif of punishment for breach of the covenant is seen in 11QTemple 59,2-13. CD's expression, "vengeance of the covenant", נקם ברית, containing the idea of God's punishment (CD 1,17-18, cf. 19,13) belongs to the same category. However, the exile is not God's final punishment: Israel was not given over to total destruction at the exile. A remnant was preserved, which is a reason for belief in the validity of the covenant in both present and future.

(e) Covenant validity is found also in the context of the covenant being qualified with reference to individuals of the past. Once, in CD 12,11, we find the "covenant of Abraham", ברית אברהם, in a passage that is part of the halakhic laws in CD 9-16. The context mentions slaves who belong to the covenant of Abraham.[40] This is a reference to the fact that all males who are part of a Jewish household are required to keep the law of circumcision, cf. Gen 17,23. Consequently, the reference to the covenant of Abraham is synonymous with circumcision.[41] When Abraham is mentioned in CD 3,2-4 together with Isaac and Jacob, they serve as examples of obedience and are accepted by God as a result of this.[42] It follows from this that those who did not keep the commandments were punished as unacceptable partners. Thus, because God is understood to be a God of reward and punishment, covenant

---

[39] This text refers to Israel's unfaithfulness which caused the wrath of God, and Israel to be delivered to the sword, and 1,3-4 contains a quotation from Ezek 39,23, which most likely refers to the events at the time of the exile interpreted as God's judgment over Israel.

[40] The context in 12,6-11 concerns laws on the relation to Gentiles.

[41] Thus, Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.165; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings*, 1961. p.155; Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, 1971, p.290. Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, 1954, p.61. Circumcision is referred to in a verbal expression in CD 16,6 in the context of Abraham and law obedience, cf Hvidberg, p.183; Lohse, p.291 interprets it as entrance to covenant; Rabin translates: "saved", p.76. Dupont-Sommer, p.162, relates it to "adherence to the sect".

[42] CD 3,2: אוהבים לאל ובעלי בריה לעולם, "friends of God and partners of the covenant", cf. Jub 6,19 and 19,9.

validity has human faithfulness as its condition.

(f) Possibly there is an allusion in CD 4,1-10 to the covenant with Levi, representing a covenant with the priesthood, related to atonement.[43] Most likely there is an allusion in CD 2,2-5 to Mal 2,7, according to which the task of the priest is to guard knowledge and give instruction (torah).[44] It is in this twofold understanding of priestly service that a potential for reinterpretation of priesthood lies.[45] When it is acknowledged that it is a priestly task and responsibility to mediate knowledge and to give instruction in the law, priestly service is extended to a non-cultic sphere, and conversely, a narrower priestly covenant emerges at the expense of a broader ethnic covenant.

In sum, covenantal identity is grounded in God's covenant, established and sustained by God. Because the covenant is grounded in the divine will and order, conditions are inherent in the covenant relationship. When only those who are loyal to the law can be true partners of the covenant, a change of emphasis is obvious. The belief that God is faithful to the promises of the past is in continuity with the Old Testament tradition, but when covenant faithfulness is related to keeping the law, then covenant validity is no longer based on God's faithfulness but on human obedience.

(2) Covenant Obedience.

From what has just been said of covenant validity, it should be clear that there is no emphasis on covenant promise without conditions. In this section I shall demonstrate how the Old Testament double promise of land and offspring is reinterpreted, by focusing on the land as a place of holiness and the requirements for remaining within the people. Both 11QTemple and CD draw on the Old Testament idea of "land", relating it to territorial identity with geographical boundaries, but they draw different conclusions, as we shall see, as to how land as a place belonging to God and set apart for Israel should be understood.[46] And while 11QTemple and CD both presuppose that the people has a special status, their concepts of status differ inasmuch as 11QTemple is concerned with the whole of Israel, and CD with a

---

[43] Of note is CD 4,9 where "covenant with the ancestors" is related to atonement. The verbal expression is כפר, which in Old Testament is used in connection with the act of revenge of Phinehas in Num 25,13, cf. Sir 45,23.

[44] Thus, Mal 2,7: "he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts". The priests are in 2,8-9 rebuked for corrupting the covenant and causing many to stumble, they have "not kept my ways, but have shown partiality" in the instruction. Cf. Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.559.

[45] This points forward to 1QS and the New Testament.

[46] For an Old Testament background, see Chapter One, II (2) (a).

fraction of the people based on the idea of the remnant. What is of particular interest in regard to identity and boundaries is 11QTemple's emphasis on spatial holiness and CD's change from land of Israel to the locality of Damascus. This raises the questions, How do radicalised demands for holiness affect the identity of land and people? Has the idea of possession of land changed from a historical-geographical place of covenant promise to mean place in a spiritualised sense?

(a) The "Eternal Inheritance of the Land" in 11QTemple. This idea is related to the purpose of the Temple Scroll. If this is to present the divine law for the people about to enter the land then "land" can be defined as the place which belongs to the people and within which God's law is valid. Thus, the opening, preserved in 11QTemple 2, set in the context of Exodus 34,10-16, points to the importance of the law as revelation, its eternal validity and to the land as a place of promise. When 11QTemple elaborates Deuteronomic and Levitical laws, the point of departure is the law as condition, not for entry into the land but for covenantal life within the land. Thus 11QTemple 51,15-16,

> "Justice and only justice, you shall follow, that you may live and come and inherit the land which I give you to inherit for all times".[47]

Although the context is correct administration of justice, this passage in itself points to obedience as the condition for maintaining the possession of the land, while the qualification, "eternal inheritance", stresses the validity of the divine promise.

It is noteworthy that the Temple Scroll follows Deuteronomy in the view that "land" is a place given by God, so that its holiness and separateness needs to be guarded.[48] This can be illustrated from 11QTemple 60,16-17: "When you come to the land which I give you, you shall not learn to follow the abominable practices of the nations." Note, that the section ends with 60,21: "You shall be blameless before the Lord your God." Moreover, the detailed prescriptions for building the temple for festivals, sacrifices and temple purity indicate that the people is identified through its cult, centered around temple as a place of holiness;[49] hence the holiness of the people is at stake. It matters less in the context of identity whether a

---

[47] Note, the use of נתן here. 51,15-16 builds on Deut 16,20; cf. also 64,12 that builds on Deut 21,23.

[48] See 11QTemple 51,16 and 56,12.

[49] That the temple is the centre of holiness, both of city and land has been demonstrated by Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle*, 1978, p.6, who shows how concentric areas of holiness exist around the presence of God. But he fails to see the connection to holiness of the people.

restored temple has an eschatological counterpart or not.

An interesting detail in the descriptions of the temple as a building, is the temple's twelve gates, one for each tribe, which shows that the writer of 11QTemple imagines that the land is inhabited by the twelve tribes, an ideal rather than a realistic situation.[50] The same ideal situation is found when the writer imagines the sacrifices to be of the whole people, עם or העם, who gather before the divine presence, in the temple, לפני יהוה.[51] This assumes the existence of a temple holding considerable space for the people to gather, and a situation in which cultic holiness applies to both land and people.[52] So too in 11QTemple 51,7-10.

> "For I am the Lord, who dwells among the children of Israel; and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and they shall be holy and let them not make themselves abominable with everything that I have set apart to them to hold unclean; and they shall be holy."

What is summed up here is the demand for both ideal and real holiness, Holiness is no longer the "concentration of sacred strength"[53] related to place. Rather the idea has developed that the identity, existence of the people and the inheritance of the land, and the remaining in it are dependent on the people's obedience.[54]

The inheritance of the land is probably in question when 11QTemple mentions the "covenant of Jacob", ברית יעקוב, in 29,10. Even if this passage is difficult to interpret because 11QTemple 29,10 breaks off in a lacuna, it seems to be more than a reference to a promise epitomised in a covenant with Jacob.[55] My reason for taking this expression in the context of inheritance

---

[50] Cf. 11QTemple 40,11-41,11; 44,3-45,4; cf. also 24,10-16.
I owe this observation to Hartmut Stegemann, in *Das Land*, 1983, p.158.

[51] עם is used frequently, but see for instance 21,6; 35,12-14. עם קדוש 48,7-10. For עם קהל, see e.g. 11QTemple 16,15-18; 18,7; 26,7.9.

[52] Cf. the prescriptions in 11QTemple 19,11-25,2. See also Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle*, 1978, p.12-13, who rightly sees "holiness" as the main concern of 11QTemple.
For the details of the design of the temple see, Johann Maier, The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of the Temple Scroll, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 1989, p.23-62.

[53] Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* III-IV, 1940, 1959, p.198.

[54] I disagree with Michael Owen Wise's conclusion, *A Critical Study*, 1990, p.200, that 11QTemple substitutes "temple" for "place". He may be right as far as temple is the important issue, but he overlooks the importance of the concentrated holiness of the people. And he overlooks the double promise of land and people in its aspect of obedience as condition for the existence of the people.

[55] There are three possible interpretations of what "covenant made with Jacob" means.
1. 11QTemple 29,10 contains a covenant promise related to the building of an eschatological temple. Thus, Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* I, 1983, p.182

of the land, is that the Genesis traditions regarding Jacob[56] contain both the double covenant promise of land and posterity (Gen 28,13-15 and 35,11-15), and the change of name from Jacob to Israel (Gen 32,28; 35,9-10). The renaming signifies change and the giving of the new name repeats the promise of inheritance, thus related to identity.[57] Thus, after a description of the festival of Tabernacles with its sacrifices on behalf of "the children of Israel" in 27,10-29,6(?), 11QTemple 29,7-10 runs,

> "I shall accept them and they shall be my people and I shall be for them for ever. I will dwell with them for ever and ever and will sanctify my sanctuary by my glory. I will cause my glory to rest on it until the day of creation on which I shall create my sanctuary, establishing it for myself for all time according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob in Bethel...."[58]

If 11QTemple 29 is seen in a context of obedience to the law the "covenant of Jacob" stands for the principle that keeping the law is a condition of God's presence in the land. In that case 11QTemple 29,10 is an echo of Leviticus 26,40-46 in which God promises to "remember" the covenant, epitomised as promise of land, on condition that the people keep the statutes and laws.[59] If this is correct, then the "covenant of Jacob" points

---

and II p.129, who points to the parallel between the statement in 11QTemple 29,7-8 and the promise of God's presence in the tabernacle in Exod 29,43-45 (cf. 2.Chr 7,16). See also Hans-Aage Mink, *DTT* 42, 1979, p.110-11. For a criticism of Yadin, see Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle*, 1978, p.90; Michael O. Wise, *RdQ* 14, 1989, p.51-53.
2. the "covenant of Jacob" refers to the election of the people, similar to what is found in Jubilees. However, there is no hint of this idea of election in the context of 11QTemple 29,19. Thus when the root of בחר is used, it is either of a place God chooses or of the Levites being chosen to serve God, for place see 52,9.16; 56,5.14; 60,13, and Levites, see 60,10; 63,3.
3.the covenant of Jacob contains the aspect of obedience as condition for the covenant.

[56] A covenant with Jacob is mentioned in Lev 26,42, cf. also Sir 44,23. In both cases "land" is an issue.

[57] Cf. Johs. Pedersen, *Israel* I-II, 1926, 1959, p.252-53. He further draws attention to Isa 62,2; 65,15, containing the hope for the giving of a "new name" to Israel.

[58] Translation Geza Vermes, except he places a full stop after Bethel, disregarding the lacuna.

[59] This interpretation I owe to Michael O. Wise, *RdQ* 14, 1989, p.54-57, and *A Critical Study*, 1990, p.157-161.
Further, he believes he can reconstruct a missing continuation on the basis of Lev 26,42, to have contained references to the covenant with Isaac and Abraham, with the same order and same emphasis on land and obedience. Thus he concludes, p.57: "The covenant in 29,3-10 is not merely a covenant to build a new temple. It is more broadly the covenant of God with the patriarchs which the redactor of the *TS* has in mind. God promised them his presence and the land. In exchange, the patriarchs were to worship and obey him. By the authority of Lev 26, the redactor saw this covenant as at one time embracing all Israel, but by their sin they had lost the land and the enjoyment of God's presence in their midst, as Lev 26 'predicts'".

not only to the promise of the presence of God in the land, but also to holiness as a covenant obligation. Lack of holiness is a breach of the covenant that leads to the hiding of God's face, cf. 11QTemple 59,4-12, which ultimately means loss of identity.

Thus, when the focus is on the covenantal promise of land the overall impression is that in 11QTemple this has conditions attached to it, so that one may conclude that covenant in general invariably has obedience as a condition, since it has law as its leading principle. The covenant with Jacob/Israel illustrates this in a particular way. It is significant that 11QTemple's concern for holiness is aimed at the whole people; covenant is used as a broad category for ethnic Israel.

(b) The "Land of Damascus" in CD. Does the phrase "new covenant in the land of Damascus", unique for CD, reinterpret the covenant? If it does, then the aspect of promise of land is perhaps in the background, so that a new locality as a place of promise outside the traditional geographical boundaries of Israel is implied. This raises the question of what "new covenant" stands for.[60] Moreover, the relation between covenant obedience and status of the people, is also at stake. Hence the first question to deal with is, How is status defined? Or, Who qualify as members of Israel?

When CD uses the word עם, "people", the context is a) in Old Testament quotations,[61] b) of Israel as a people[62] from whom a few/some have withdrawn, and c) of the converted few, withdrawn to live according to the law.[63] There is no trace of the idea, found emphasised in Jubilees, that the whole people is elected.

It is one of the characteristic features of CD that it takes the exile as a point of departure, and with this, the loss of the land is interpreted as a result of sin. This is obvious from CD 1,4-12 and 6,2-11. Moreover, in CD 2,14-16 the present disobedience of Israel is described as parallel to the exilic situation.[64] Or disobedience is condemned as in CD 2,7-9:

Wise further argues for the idea that the redactor is a member of the community behind the earlier parts of CD. To this I shall return below.

[60] For the question of "new covenant", see below in II (3).

[61] CD 1,21 (Ps 18,44; 2 Sam 22,44); 5,16 (Isa 27,11); 6,16 (Isa 10,2); 7,11 (Isa 7,17); 9,2 (Lev 19,18).

[62] CD 8,8.

[63] CD 6,4.8; 8,16; 19,19 and perhaps 19,35.

[64] In CD, disobedience to the God-given law, as acts of transgression, is the main substance in sin. See E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.273.
In other words, humans are sinners before God, more because of lack of

> "For God has not chosen them from of old, ‹from the days of eternity›, and before they were established He knew their works and abhorred the generations when they arose, and He hid His face from the land from their arising until their being consumed."

In extension to this, we find the idea in CD 5,20-21 and 3,10 that because the covenant was violated through sins in the past, "the land became desolate". In contrast, CD 2,2-6 sets the obedience of a remnant. How is the remnant identified?

When using the term שאירת, "remnant", CD 1,4-5 qualifies it as the remnant of Israel[65] alluding to Ezra 9,8.13-15, or to the Old Testament prophets' hope for a remnant that will restore Israel, its land and people.[66] In CD 1,4-5 the remnant is, either a remnant in the past, or a present remnant, preserved by God.[67] The remnant in the past was chosen to do the covenant will of God (cf. CD 3,10-14), and to them the hidden laws of the covenant were revealed (CD 3,14-16). The implication of this is that if the present remnant lives according to the law they have a special status as chosen, unlike the non-chosen for whom there is no remnant, cf. CD 2,6-7. The "remnant" is not an abstract term, rather it stands for a real and concrete group of people. The connection between past and present is essentially a link of obedience, identified in concrete persons.[68] From the point of view of the identity of the community behind CD, the present remnant is understood as a self-designation, and CD's author establishes, by acknowledging roots in the past, a succession between faithfulness in the past and present obedience.[69] In this way obedience to the covenant is related to past and present acceptance of the covenant law.

---

behaviour than because sin is a lack of quality. Thus Herbert Braun, *Radikalismus*, 1969, p.133.

[65] Cf. 2,11, פליטה לארץ, a remnant for the land.

[66] See for instance, Isa 8,16-18; 11,16; 28,5; 37,31-2; 44,17. Micah 2,12; 4,6-7; 5,7-8. Jer 25,20; 39,3; 40,15; 41,10. Ezek 9,8; 25,16.
Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes*, 1963, p.32.

[67] Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, interprets CD 2,11-12, the remnant that God caused to be raised, to be part of a recurring rhythm of history. Thus p.218: "A chaque époque, Dieu a donc fait surgir un Reste fidèle sous la conduite de ses inspirés: 'les oints de son Esprit Saint'", cf. also p.221.

[68] Against Annie Jaubert, Ibid., 1963, who points out, that an identification of the remnant is difficult, because the remnant in CD is "de type prophétique, non historique" (p.221). Rather by being models of behaviour the figures in the past cease to be representatives of the people, as in the Old Testament. They become individualized in order to provide examples for individuals to whom appeals are made.

[69] Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.57. Cf. also his comments on CD 2,11, p.73, that CD's author, in mentioning the two main groups of the past, the "converted" and the "wicked", shows his love towards the present community and his hate towards those who oppose it.

For CD the essential and most important thing is to do the will of God as this is revealed in the concrete covenant commands, expressed in the covenant of Sinai, but known especially to the faithful remnant. This can be illustrated from the command to obedience in CD 3,12-16,

> "But with them that held fast with the commandments of God who were left over of them, God established His covenant with Israel even until eternity, by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel has gone astray. His holy sabbaths and His glorious appointed times, His righteous testimonies and His true ways and the requirements of His desire, which man shall do and live thereby, these he laid open before them."

The meaning of this is that the sabbath and the festivals function as symbols of obedience, they designate who belong to Israel as a people. It is implied that simultaneously they are symbols of holiness since they have a divine origin. Elsewhere CD's command to keep the Sabbath (10,14-12,5) is elaborate and strict, and also with an emphasis on holiness (10,17). It is, however, noteworthy that Sabbath is not interpreted as a symbol of relationship as in Jubilees, nor is the Sabbath said to be a sign of the covenant.[70]

Unlike the Temple Scroll which depends on the Old Testament demand for holiness, CD does not draw on the holiness of God as a motif, nor on the concentration of divine power in a particular place set apart for God.[71] Rather the motivation for keeping the law is found in God's punishment of those who disregard the divine will. The anger of God is caused by not doing, which again is equal to a breach of the covenant (CD 3,1-12).[72] When CD ties the motivation for holiness to the command to separate clean and unclean, holy and profane, the covenant is interpreted as a priestly covenant (CD 6,17; 7,3); this is a covenant for the few. Further, when CD refers to "the men of perfect holiness" (20,2.5.7) this is somehow a designation of the community, or perhaps members of the community who have a special, or

---

[70] To interpret the purpose of the community as obedience to the laws on Sabbath, festivals and calendar is too narrow an understanding of the covenant and of the purpose of the community. See Johannes A. Huntjens, *RdQ* 8, 1972-75, p.361-80, esp.p.362-70, where he even identifies covenant and Sabbath on the basis of 1Q22. This seems to be an over-interpretation of a text that speaks of law and covenant.

[71] There is no allusion to Lev 11,45 or Exod 19,5-6.

[72] Thus the history of Israel's past, from the sons of Noah, is a history of not doing the will of the creator. All Israel has gone astray by not observing the Sabbath, the Festivals, the way and will of God (CD 3,14-15) and for this disobedience destruction is the responsive act of God (CD 3,10-11). Conversely, obedience gives a guarantee of salvation (CD 3,15-16). Likewise, those who "walk in perfection of holiness" according to instructions are promised life for a thousand generations (CD 7,5-7). Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.118: "Hier werden Gnade und Gesetz unmittelbar in eins geschaut, und das Gesetz damit selbst Bürgschaft des Heils".

higher, status within it.[73] Whether this is a status of order within the community or of authority over it, is difficult to say from the material at hand. What is significant is the connection between obedience and holiness. In short, the overall impression is that perfect holiness is the goal, no longer for the people as a whole, but rather for those individuals who are an elite within it. The significance of this is that only the few converted who live according to the law preserve that status of holiness on which a future restoration of the people depends (e.g. CD 20,34). What meaning should we then give to the "land of Damascus"?

It is characteristic that nowhere in CD is the possession of the land said to be a present or future blessing of the covenant for the people. And even if CD 2,11 "a remnant for the land" is open to such a reinterpretation of the land, this is not likely because the emphasis is on the obedience of the remnant, not on the promise of land.

When CD uses the term, "land of Damascus", this can have two meanings, either a literal-geographical or a metaphorical-symbolic meaning.[74] The problem emerges most clearly in the expression from CD 6,5, where in a midrash of Num. 21,18, "the diggers of the well" are interpreted as those who "turned from Israel" and went "out of the land of Judah" to sojourn "in the land of Damascus" (cf. 4,2).[75] Scholars disagree on the meaning of this passage, some taking it literally either to mean a departure from Judah to Damascus, implying an exile in Damascus;[76] or, still literally, as a "Qumran community" outside the Qumran site - perhaps a reference to Damascus as a place of refuge for the "Qumran community".[77] In both cases a change of place

---

[73] See Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.192.
Göran Forkman, *The Limits*, 1972, p.66, interprets the phrase "the men of perfect holiness" as a designation of "the perfect members of the sect, in contrast to the outer circle of members on the novice level", and draws on the parallel in 1QS 8,20. However, there is no clear evidence for such a distinction here.

[74] Thus Damascus means either a geographical locality (literally, Damascus, or transferred, of Qumran) or it is a symbol for a place of refuge. For a survey of this problem see Phillip R. Callaway, *History*, 1988, p.121-27, referring to Philip R. Davies' discussion. See following note.

[75] The phrase, שבי ישראל in 4,2; 6,5; 8,16 and 19,29 is with Rabin rendered as "they that turned (from the impiety) of Israel", cf. Eduard Lohse, "die Umkehrenden/ die Bekehrten Israels".
See further Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928. p.85.
Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, p.93, in accordance with his whole approach, maintains that the phrase means "captivity of Israel", designating those who literally went out of Israel to live in captivity.

[76] This is the classical approach for which Flemming Friis Hvidberg, Ibid., e.g. p.113, is a typical representative.

[77] For references see Philip R. Davies, Ibid., 1983, p.17.

is implied, by some sort of relocation to a new district outside Israel (cf. CD 2,5; 6,1). Most scholars, however, would prefer a metaphorical interpretation, so that Damascus means a symbolic place, in terms of a symbol of refuge.[78] From the point of view of covenant theology, Damascus seems to refer to a place defined by its holiness. That holiness requires a place, or even a land, seems to be implied in CD 1,7-8:

> "He visited them; and He caused to grow forth from Israel and Aaron 'a root of cultivation, to possess His land'[79] and to wax fat in the goodness of His soil".

In this passage both "land" and "people" occur. However, if we keep in mind that only a faithful "remnant" shall "possess the land",[80] an obvious change of self-understanding has taken place. Because the emphasis is on the holiness of the few who are conscious that covenant relationship entails obedience, in reality the remnant community replaces "people". And by focusing on holiness as a human quality the importance of the place as such has been reduced in favour of the holiness of those who inhabit it.[81] However, it is difficult to say whether this is related to a universalistic idea that the world belongs to God.[82] What is most significant about "place" is that it is, if not spiritualised, at least transformed <u>from locality to lifestyle</u>.

<u>In sum.</u> Both 11QTemple and CD acknowledge a continuation of revelation and accept covenant, temple, cult and priesthood. In 11QTemple covenant is clearly identified as obedience. While covenant stands for law and promise in principle, in reality covenantal blessings are never accentuated. CD is concerned with covenant in its validity for the remnant; the faithful hope to inherit its promises through obedience. This means holiness becomes a means of covenant identification. When therefore obedience becomes the principle on which the covenant relationship rests, the Old Testament aspect of promise may be retained. At the same time it is changed into a promise that is <u>conditional on obedience</u>. Moreover from the converse idea of disobedience as breach of the covenant, a hope for renewal of the covenant, for a restoration of people and land emerges and becomes a demand for purity, as we shall see in my next chapter, on 1QS.

---

[78] See Phillip R. Callaway, *History*, 1988, p.121-27, who cautiously concludes, p.124: "VII,14-15,18, VI,5 and VI,18-19 do seem to have a literal exile to Damascus in mind. In any case the name is never interpreted otherwise in CD. This event, at least in its present context, lies at some unspecified time in the past."

[79] An echo of Isa 60,21, but not a quotation.

[80] Noted already by Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.63.

[81] Thus also concluded by Hartmut Stegemann, in *Das Land*, 1983, p.165.

[82] Cf. Ibid, p.154.

(3) "Broken Covenant" and "New Covenant".

If the covenant is identified as law, it follows that disobedience is a breach of the covenant. But if breach of covenant brings God's anger and subsequent punishment, How is the covenant relationship restored?

In respect of vocabulary for covenant breach, 11QTemple and CD use a variety of terms, to transgress the covenant/the ordinances, to forsake the covenant/the commandments and to despise the covenant/the ordinances.[83] This variety is, as we shall see, more a matter of style than of content, thus confirming my previous statement that law and covenant are two sides of one coin.[84] When one looks at these instances, the notion of the broken covenant falls roughly into two categories, Israel of the past, and enemies and/or apostates of the present community.

(a) Broken Covenant. Instead of appealing to election and right behaviour as means of restoring the relationship with God,, as in Jubilees, 11QTemple appeals particularly to restoration through atonement for sin. On the one hand, God is the subject of the act of atonement, cf. 11QTemple 63,6;[85] but on the other hand, the cult serves the purpose of dealing with the people's sin and/or transgressions. Sacrifices are offered to fulfil the Old Testament law, such as Lev 16,33 and Num 28,30. They are the traditional means by which the covenant relationship is restored. Atonement is for the עם קהל.[86] No rites substitute for sacrifices.

When CD deals with the broken covenant and reconciliation, God is always the

---

[83] The Hebrew roots are respectively, (a) עבר constructed with: בריה 11QTemple 55,7; CD 1,20; 16,12; מצוה CD 10,3 (cf. CD 15,3-4 on oaths); (b) עזב constructed with: בריה CD 3,11; מצוה CD 8,19; 19,33; as עזבוהו CD 1,3; (c) מאס constructed with: בריה CD 20,11; מצוה CD 8,19; 19,32; מצוה and חוק CD 19,4-5; (d) פרר with בריה 11QTemple 59,8, cf. CD 1,20 where פרר חוק and עבר בריה are juxtaposed.
For a juxtaposition of בריה and חוק see also CD 5,12; 20,11-12; 20,29.

[84] The same tendency to identify covenant as obedience to the law of Moses can be found in CD, 15,9-10, "they shall muster him with the oath of the covenant which Moses concluded with Israel, namely the covenant to return to the Law of Moses with all one's heart and with all one's soul". Cf. CD 15,2.12 and 16,2.5: "law of Moses" CD 5,8.; 8,14; 19,26: "Moses said" and CD 5,21: "the commandments of God given by the hand of Moses".

[85] Cf. Deut 21,9.

[86] See e.g.11QTemple 16,14; 18,7; 26,7-9; 32,6.
The verbal expression for atonement is כפר, for which the priest, as in an Old Testament context, is subject. Cf. Bernd Janowski - Herman Lichtenberger, *JJS* 34, 1983, esp. p.54-55.
This does not diminish the fact that there is also a critical attitude to an unacceptable practice, cult and belief of the contemporary Judaism.

subject of the atoning act,[87] except in the ambiguous passage, CD 14,19, in which the Messiah of Aaron and Israel will make conciliation for transgressions. This could refer to a Messiah who will bring atonement, or to the atonement given by God and mediated through the priestly Messiah. In both cases God is seen as the source of reconciliation. The initiative comes from God.[88] Apart from this, we find the idea that humans may turn from sin by choosing to enter the covenant, which in CD 4,9-10 is defined as a covenant God established "to make conciliation for their trespasses". Sacrifices are probably presupposed in CD 9,14; 11,17-23; 16,13, and the view that the atoning function is enacted by the community seems to be indicated in 4,6-9 and 7,5 where holiness may be a substitute for sacrifices.[89]

These two views belong to different contexts. They differ on what function the cult has. A tentative conclusion is that they belong to <u>different communities</u>, but it is impossible to decide whether CD presupposes 11QTemple or vice versa. Besides it is not important in this context.

<u>CD</u> further deals with breach of the covenant, thus using scripture to identify who are "in" and who are "out".[90] When CD draws on the Old Testament idea that God punishes those who break the covenant, scripture is received and interpreted as giving both a positive and a negative view of covenant identity. In a way this runs through as a theme in CD 1,2-8,21, where the author moves backwards and forwards between past and present, between cause and effect.

On the one hand, scripture is quoted or echoed to prove both the negative and the positive effects of what covenant relationship meant in <u>past</u> history, and on the other, scripture is used as foundation for creating an awareness of what covenant relationship means in the <u>present</u> situation. I shall illustrate this from a few passages and then discuss the eschatological passage in which CD reuses Ezek 44,15 as a means of identifying the community.

---

[87] CD 2,4-5; 3,18; 4,6-10; 20,34.

[88] Thus, CD 2,4-5, "patience is beside Him and abundance of pardon to forgive those who repent of sin". Cf. CD 15,7; 20,17.
See, Paul Garnet, *Salvation*, 1977, p.98-99.

[89] See E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.299.

[90] For the view that CD's use of scripture is "a success pattern", see, Wayne O. McCready, in *Proceedings*, 1981, p.85-90, By this he means that CD presents Israel's history, or patriarchal models of faithfulness, in a pattern that in the context of the present community serves to identify faithfulness, both in its continuation to the past and in its sameness at present.

In the opening, CD 1,2-12, the writer refers to the exile as "epoch of wrath" as well as the occasion out of which God caused "a root to grow forth";[91] and in 1,13-2,1 this is interpreted in relation to "the last generation."[92] Thus, the "congregation of the faithless", עדת בוגדים, is identified by its lack of covenant obedience, "causing others to break the covenant", and it faces the wrath of God as a consequence. CD 3,1-12a[93] gives the history of disobedience from Noah onwards, referring to the Israelites as guilty, hence punished for breaking the covenant of God.[94] 3,12b-4,11 refers to faithfulness and reward in a general way. From the point of view of identity, cause and effect is one key to understanding this complicated passage. Finally, the scripture is interpreted in CD 5,17-6,11[95] alluding to the opposition to Moses, to Jamnes and his brother causing the "destruction of the land", interpreted as tools of Belial. Simultaneously, an identification of the present community is given. They are those who have entered the covenant, "people of understanding" or "people of wisdom", for whose sake God will remember the covenant, that is restore the relationship. The purpose of these scriptural interpretations seems to be to create an awareness of present identity that can be recognised from the past, reflected as it is in the Old Testament characters and events.

In addition to these examples, CD 3,21-4,2 quotes and interprets Ezek 44,15, by adding a significant future dimension. When this passage is considered in a context of identity, it may throw light particularly on the goal of the group. I shall quote the full passage from 3,18-4,4,

---

[91] When CD 1,2o interprets "transgress the covenant" and "break the ordinances", ויעבירו ברית ויפירו חוק, as the reason for God's anger and punishment, this is in line with the Old Testament prophetic tradition. Cf. CD 16,12 and 20,29.

[92] J. Murphy-O'Connor, *RB* 77, 1970, p.225-29, takes 1,1-2,13 as introduction to the missionary document, CD 2,14-6,1, with an emphasis on human conversion over against divine election/predestination.
Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, takes CD 1,1-2,1 as a subsection to his section on history containing a covenantal *rib*-pattern, cf. p.58-72, following Lars Hartman, *Asking*, 1979.

[93] Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, p.76-104, takes CD 2,14-4,12b as the third subsection on history, with 3,1-12 as the central part.

[94] Note also, the future dimension in the reaction to apostates of the community, on which the wrath of God is expected to fall, CD 19,31-34, "But God hates and abhors the "builders of the wall" and his anger is aroused against them and against all who follow them. And like this judgment (it will be) for everyone who rejects the commandments of God and forsakes them". Translation Philip R. Davies.

[95] Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, p.119-125, takes this section as part of his section on laws.

"But God in His wonderful mysteries made conciliation for their trespass and pardoned their impiety, 'and He built them a sure house' in Israel, the like of which has not stood from ancient times even until now. They that hold fast to it are destined for eternal life and all glory of man (אדם) is theirs; as God swore to them by the hand of the prophet Ezekiel, saying: 'The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok, who kept charge of My sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from Me, they shall approach ‹Me to minister unto Me, and they shall stand before Me to offer› Me fat and blood'.[96] The Priests are 'they that turned (from impiety) of Israel' who went out of the land of Judah; and ‹the Levites are› they that joined themselves with them; and the sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel, the '*men* called by name' who shall arise in the end of days".

The train of thought runs from God's initial forgiveness to God's establishment of a "sure house" and into a promise of eternal life for those who remain faithful. The passage from Ezekiel refers back to, builds on and explains the phrase "sure house".

The main problem is that "house" is ambivalent because either temple or dynasty could be implied. My first question is, Is "sure house" used as a self-designation? If "sure house" alludes to the promise in 1 Sam 2,35 of a house to the sons of Zadok, it could be a term for a priestly family.[97] It could equally be an allusion to 2 Sam 7, where the promise is of a Davidic dynasty as well as of a temple.[98] In view of this, "house" in CD 3,18-4,2 could allude to the continuation of the Davidic dynasty with the temple as the "place" for the worship and presence of God. If this interpretation is aimed at the CD community, perhaps "house" is best taken as a synthesis of the community of priests serving at the temple (either the real or the spiritualized temple).[99] But, if CD 3,18-4,4 is parallel to the other

---

[96] In Ezek 44,15 there is only one group, the priests, qualified as descendants of Zadok: "But the levitical priests, the descendants of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary".- Its function is to be in charge of the sacrificial system.
In CD there are three groups, an interpretation made possible by the twice added "and". Cf. Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.84.

[97] See Chapter One II (4) (a).

[98] Dynasty: 7,11.16-17.25.27.29; temple: 7,5.6-7.13. Cf. 1 Sam 25,28; 1 Kings 11,38; 1 Chr 22,6, mentioned above in Chapter One. Cf. also the clear reference, the Covenant of Davidic kingdom, in 4QPBless 2.4.

[99] For this view see, Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 1971, p.75-80. He states, "Die am *Haus festhalten* (3,20) entsprechen denen, die den Dienst am *Heiligtum bewahrt* haben (4,1f.)", p.78 (author's italic). Klinzing proposes that the Qumran community uses and reinterprets the cultic language, although he rejects the view that the cult, and the temple, is spiritualized, "Der Kultus wird nicht durch eine selbstevidente Moral ersetzt, sondern das ganze Leben der Gemeinde mit in den Kultus hineingenommen", p.146.
For the temple as real, see Philip R. Davies, *JJS* 33, 1982, p.287-301, who

scriptural references which have faithfulness as their theme, then this passage refers to a community's understanding of its origin, its cultic holiness perhaps reinterpreted in ethical terms by adding that God's act of forgiveness is related to the present group of the faithful and adding also the future dimension, the common goal, and eternal life.

My second question is, Is there a self-designation in the use and interpretation of the passage from Ezekiel 44,15? In Ezekiel 44 the covenant is abominated and broken because foreigners, the uncircumcised in heart and flesh, profane God's sanctuary, causing extermination. We note that Ezekiel uses covenant disobedience in a cultic rather than a historical sense.[100]

If Ezek 44 is applied to the community, one possibility is that this refers to the historical, exilic origin of the community. In that case the reference to the "sons of Zadok" could refer to a group that will join in the eschatological age.[101] If the present community sees itself both in continuity with history and on the march towards the future, to be like a restored past, then the relation between events in the past, present and future is essentially one of linearity. Another possibility is that this refers to a pattern of faithfulness, in which all in the community are defined in relation to each other. Thus, those who went out are identified as those who in the past turned from Israel. The "going out" is then not literally but metaphorically a turning from (Israel's) sin. And those who "joined" them should be identified as a past or present group. Finally those who "shall arise in the end of the days" refers to a present or a future addition to the community. If various groups are identified in relation to each other, history is the foundation, but origin is not an issue, because essentially they all belong to "the elect of Israel", and all are identified in their status as faithful to God's covenant law. It matters less whether the expression "end of the days" refers to a future or a present, realised eschatology. In both cases, the self-understanding that is involved is particularistic, because covenant stands for an exclusive relationship between Israel, or part of Israel, and its God.

---

takes the laws in CD 11-16 to be evidence for the acceptance of the Jerusalem temple. Similarly CD 6,11f in its original form points to a use of the temple, while the present text is a product of a redactor hostile to temple worship.

[100] See Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.69-70 and J.J.P.Valeton, *ZAW* 13, 1893, p.245-79, esp. p.256.

[101] Noted by Flemming Friis Hvidberg, Ibid., p.86 and Jacob Liver, *RdQ* 6, 1967-69, p.3-30.

It is unfortunately not possible to get a clear picture from CD of the exact identity of the "sons of Zadok", whether they are a small group that is part of the community, or the community as a whole.[102] It seems to be a sort of self-designation, or CD's three groups can be seen as an interpretation of how the community is structured, otherwise the additions[103] in the quotation are difficult to explain.[104] To be brief, the context points to a group that sees itself either in continuity with a historic group in Israel's past,[105] or as a group whose obedience maintains faithfulness according to the covenant obligations. Moreover, if the Ezekiel context is considered, there is also a cultic setting, in which case holiness is the key word. It may not be an either-or choice because the expression "sons of Zadok" may contain two ideas, a reference to the remnant that preserves holiness through obedience, and an allusion to historical roots. It is impossible to decide whether ethical obedience or cultic holiness is most important or whether one replaces the other.

In short, the present awareness of God's covenant, is both an awareness of belonging to a history of faithfulness and a consciousness that obedience is necessary in order to restore the covenant in its original aspect of promise.[106] When the emphasis is on faithfulness, human commitment is a necessary condition both for the expected reward from God, "the eternal life", and for a new covenant.

(b) "New Covenant" in CD. There is no reference to a "new covenant" in the Temple Scroll. However, it may be implied assuming the purpose of the book is to provide a new law.[107] In contrast to this, CD uses the phrase "the new covenant" and qualifies it as "the new covenant of the land of Damascus", ברית החדשה בארץ דמשק.[108] What is most conspicuous is the fact that "new cove-

---

[102] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.246.

[103] Cf. note 96 above.

[104] It seems less satisfactory to see in this passage a reference to the structure of the community because the three groups are not given different duties, nor are they ranked as in 14,3-4, cf. Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.122.
For the suggestion that this is not a likely interpretation, unless the sons of Zadok are identified as the children of Israel, which again means that the sons of Zadok designate the community as a whole, see Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 1963, p.207.

[105] Zadok, high-priest of David would be a person to identify with.

[106] Arvid S. Kapelrud, in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.147; E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.242, cf. p.295; Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.566.

[107] Note, that חדש is not used in a context of law in 11QTemple.

[108] See CD 6,19; 8,21; 19,33-34 and 20,12.

nant" is not given or established by God; "new covenant" is what humans belong to or enter into.[109]

The ambiguity of the expression "new covenant" is clear. The question is not whether "new covenant" is an allusion to Jeremiah 31 or not.[110] Even if there is an allusion to Jeremiah, the context there is, as I demonstrated, that covenant is "new law". Moreover Jeremiah expresses a hope for a different quality to the covenant relationship.[111] With respect to "new", one problem in CD is, whether "new" presupposes "old". Another problem is whether the newness lies in God's restoring the already existing relationship to its eternal validity, not by adding or changing prescriptions, but by recollecting promises; or in humanity's attempt to restore a relationship by reinforcing the already given obligations. Is newness understood in relation to God's giving new revelation? Is the term used as self-identification for the community? Or, Is the "new covenant" to be realised eschatologically, in the present and/or future?

Most important perhaps is the observation that the term "new covenant" is never opposed to an "old covenant".[112] Consequently, "new covenant" cannot be understood simply as replacement of an old covenant.[113] Rather, "new covenant"

---

[109] I shall return to the question of entry below in II (2).

[110] Scholars disagree whether CD is drawing on Jeremiah or not in its use of the term "new covenant".
For a balanced view see Phillip R. Callaway, *History*, 1988, p.126, who states that there is a possible dependence on Jer 31 or traditions arising from it.
Some find a clear allusion to Jer 31,31. Thus e.g. Matthew Black, *The Scrolls*, 1961, p.91; Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität*, 1982, p.136: "Im Hintergrund dürfte nicht nur Jer 31,31-34 stehen, sondern die Tradition vom Bund Gottes mit seinem Volk insgesamt. Die Gemeinde, für die der Normenkatalog gilt, sieht sich als den "Neuen Bund", der dem alten Bund gegenübersteht. Dabei sind die Aspekte Bruch und Kontinuität in gleicher Weise wichtig."
See also Young Ki Yu, *The New Covenant*, Durham PhD, 1989, who concludes, in his chapter 3, that "new covenant" in the Dead Sea Scrolls is closely linked with Jer 31 which is a prophecy fulfilled in the history of the community. However, his argument rests on the presupposition that CD reflects the "Qumran" community.
Others deny any direct allusion on the basis that the differences are too great, e.g. Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.571-79.
Some avoid choosing sides by pointing to the fact that "new" (cf. CD 3,10-14) refers to new revelations. Thus, E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.240-41.

[111] See Chapter One II (4) (b).

[112] Contrary to the New Testament, cf. below in Chapter Six.
This has been stressed by Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.210, following Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.119-120.

[113] It seems to be a necessary condition in CD for a "new covenant" that the prescriptions of the ("old") law are constantly taught, and that the law has to be kept according to its correct interpretation. Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer,

is used as distinct from a broken covenant. Thus the problem is related to covenant validity. This again involves a change of emphasis from exterior to interior covenant. If therefore, newness refers to the content of a covenant, newness must be seen in relation to the two aspects, conditions and promises.

With regard to content, the question is whether a "new initiative on the part of God" is so integral to the "sectarian" covenant, that a new content to the "new" covenant has been revealed.[114] This argument hinges first of all on what the expression in 3,14, "hidden things", means. Secondly it depends on whether covenant of God, בריתו, refers to a "new" covenant, or to the "one covenant" of the past in its present validity. CD's own interpretation seems to refer to those obligations which (all) Israel did not keep: "holy Sabbaths" and "glorious appointed times", thus to the obligatory aspect of the past. So, rather than interpreting "hidden things" in terms of a new content of promise, I propose that "hidden things" means radicalised demands, new ways of interpreting the already existing covenant laws on keeping the Sabbath and the Festivals by means of which a new and different quality of covenant relationship is made possible.[115] The new quality is related to human response to covenant in its eternal validity as law. Thus, instead of "new covenant" referring to God's new promises, meaning God has established a new relationship, "new covenant" seems for CD to imply new conditions for one and the same covenant.

If this is correct then "new covenant" may be a polemical phrase, coined by one group opposed to another, perhaps a group that has broken away from the movement.[116] Be this as it may, the significance lies in the interpretation of the expression within the context of the present identity, understood as a valid and eternal covenant relationship based on obedience and evoking a hope for a future for all Israel. This raises the question, Is the term "new covenant" seen in continuity with or in contrast to a past covenantal identity?

Ibid., 1913, p.119.
I fail to see how Arvid S. Kapelrud, in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.14, can justify the view that CD operates with an old covenant.

[114] Thus E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.242.

[115] This would be in line with the the Book of Jubilees and its emphasis on keeping Sabbath and Festivals, both for the sake of uniting the people, and because of the validity of the covenant obligations. See Chapter Two.

[116] Thus Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 1983, esp. Chapter V, p.173-97.

If "new covenant" is a positive identity term, newness could be understood to mean a restored covenant of promise and law by adding an eschatological dimension of hope.[117] I have already said that the detailed prescriptions seem to serve the purpose of ensuring that the eternal covenant law is kept, with the hope that God will remember the initial promises and thus renew them. If this view is applied to "new covenant" then "new" refers to restoration of the law which CD then sees fulfilled in the coming of the "teacher of righteousness".[118] If new covenant is applied to promise, then "new" could refer to the Old Testament message of forgiveness, which in CD's interpretation becomes a realised eschatological promise. It is noteworthy that where Jeremiah understands "new covenant" as future, CD takes "new covenant" as a present reality.[119] All this, therefore, points to "new covenant" as an expression of a self-understanding within the community, as a presently realised different relationship to God which, on the one hand builds on a prophetic foundation of forgiveness, and on the other sees holiness as a goal to be achieved through obedience in the present and future. Against this background it matters less whether CD can be said to express opposition to all Israel or to some other group. The wider perspective of this is that obedience restores and maintains a relationship to God, out of which hope for all Israel grows. Of note also is the emphasis on human commitment which reflects a theology of restoration that is in tension with the idea that change is exclusively the result of God's creative act.[120]

Summary. When the Old Testament tradition is taken as a point of departure for identity, CD reflects on the experience of the exile, interpreted as punishment, as a result of the wrath of God, but also as an experience of hope. In relation to covenantal identity, covenant functions, with Ernst Lohmeyer, as a principle of assessment of history, "das Prinzip der Beurteilung der bisherigen Geschichte".[121] The Temple Scroll is conscious of

---

[117] See Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.120: "Um der Berith mit den Vorfahren willen sendet Gott den Messias und mit ihm die "neue Ordnung"; diese neue ist eine Repristination der alten."

[118] I shall not discuss the role of the teacher of righteousness, because of the peripheral role he plays in the context of identity. See Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 1963.

[119] Or as Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.582 formulates it: "the eschatological *new* covenant has become *concrete* in a *historical* realization". (Author's italic.)

[120] This tension I shall return to in the context of Paul's view in Gal 4,6, that the status of being "children of God" is a divine decision, not a human choice.

[121] *Diatheke*, 1913, p.118.

past tradition, values and beliefs, but is also aware of new adaptations of past laws, so that the covenant of the past functions to emphasize sameness, especially when maintaining the cult as a traditional means of forgiveness. In both 11QTemple and CD, the present covenant relationship is related to its obligatory aspect, the reinforcement of the law. Arising from a demand for priestly purity both expect a restoration of holiness, the goal is for the whole people to reach holiness and perfection. Thus, identity has been narrowed down from an ethnic to a priestly covenant, which is clear, particularly in CD, where the awareness of being part of the priestly "new covenant" creates a consciousness of narrow boundaries which ultimately creates a boundary within Israel, as we shall now see.

II. Ritual Boundaries.

Compared to the Book of Jubilees the change in both identity and boundaries is clear, especially in CD, and to a lesser degree in 11QTemple. Where Jubilees defines boundaries by birth and election, demanding affirmation of belonging through circumcision, 11QTemple is concerned with a pure cult and cultic boundaries, extending the boundaries of purity to city and people; and CD calls for a return to holiness, and entry to the covenant, thereby setting a boundary on the basis of commitment. The questions are, What does entry, in terms of entry to the covenant, mean? Is there an entry from outside Israel? Are there boundaries around the people, or within? What are the symbolic marks for boundary crossings?

(1) Return and Entry to the Covenant.

Judged in terms of use of the vocabulary of election, 11QTemple and CD show surprisingly little concern for the theology of election, so prominent in Jubilees. Thus בחר and בחיר are only rarely used, and as I have already pointed out, in 11QTemple God's election refers to the temple location, Zion, the Levites and the king.[122] Nowhere is the people, or community referred to as elect, although it may be implied in the biblical expression, "they shall be my people". In CD election, בחיר, is used of the priesthood, identified as "the elect" along with the "Sons of Zadok".[123] In relation to identity, it is possible that "the elect" is a sort of self-designation of the community,[124] but it is equally possible that it stands in apposition to

---

[122] See above in I (2) (a).

[123] Only occurrence in CD 4,3-4. Cf. 1QpHab 5,4; 9,12; 10,13 where the use of "elect" is ambiguous, either of the community or the Teacher of righteousness. See, *Dødehavsteksterne,* 1959, p.13. 23-24.26.

[124] Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden,* 1928, p.86; E.P. Sanders, *Paul,* 1977,

the "Sons of Zadok", so that we have some sort of historical and/or eschatological explanation of origin. The instances where CD uses the verb בחר are all, except CD 2,7,[125] in a context of human choice, that is choice between right and wrong.[126] The possible significance of this usage is that a change of emphasis from divine election to human choice can be detected, although the lack of use could have other explanations.

Compared to the Old Testament and Jubilees' consciousness of having been given the covenant by divine choice, CD, as demonstrated above, appreciates the covenant as established by human choice, emphasising human obedience. In order to restore the broken covenant a conscious choice needs to be made. This choice is referred to in the language designating movement, such as in CD's phrase, כל באי ברית, "all who enter (or have entered) the covenant", used as an address or in explanations.[127] What does this mean? It is appropriate at this point to recall that the Old Testament use of בוא is wide-ranging, with both secular and religious connotations.[128] In its basic meaning the verb designates a movement towards a goal, either in space or in time;[129] it may be used literally of going from one space to another, or figuratively in the sense of entering into, either a community or a certain belief-system. This means that בוא can be used for a literal crossing of a geographical boundary. But, as I pointed to in Chapter One, even geographical boundaries are God-given, so that if a crossing takes place, it happens in obedience to the divine command, and entry takes place by divine guarantee. Further, when the Old Testament uses בוא figuratively, as for instance in Jer 34,10, "enter the covenant", this has overtones of commitment, so that boundaries are drawn according to obedience. In the cases where בוא is associated with entering the presence of God, e.g. the temple or the sanctuary, a cultic dimension is added so that crossing boundaries to the holy is to enter into the presence of God.[130]

Against this background, I shall focus on obedience and commitment as the

---

p.246.

[125] Here the context has God as subject, but in a negative connotation, of those whom God did not choose.

[126] Cf. CD 1,18-19; 2,15; 3,2.11; 8,8; 19,20.

[127] Frequently ברית is constructed with the root of בוא (CD 2,2; 3,10; 6,9.11.19; 8,1.21; 9,3; 12,11; 13,14; 15,5; 19,13-14; 19,33-34). Twice עדה (13,13; 14,10) with בוא, once מחנה with בוא (13,4).

[128] For an overview see H.D. Preuss, *TDOT* II, 1975. p.22-49.

[129] For this and the following see Ibid., esp. p.21.27-30.

[130] For Old Testament references, see Ibid. p.22-25.

most pertinent aspects to CD's understanding of entry to the covenant. In the contexts in which "enter the covenant" occurs, the motivation is obedience, commitment to fulfill the law. By submitting to the will of God the covenant is restored, and a boundary crossed.[131] It is noteworthy that the covenant is established when humans enter and that the covenant is valid only for those who actually respond to it. Thus entry is tied to legal observance, and boundaries are drawn accordingly. From this perspective, entry also has holiness as a goal or purpose; hence CD clearly sees both the avoidance of God's judgment and holiness as interdependent and ultimate goals. Thus, CD 7,4-6:

> "(As for) all who walk according to these injunctions, in perfect holiness, following all His instruction - the covenant of God is established for them that they may live for a thousand generations."[132]

Or, CD 3,20: "Those who adhere to it will live for ever and all the glory of Adam (כבוד אדם) shall be theirs".[133]

What is promised here is a restoration of creation, not of the covenant, and what is expected is an escape from judgment, and a participation in the promise of life, the goal being perfection as creation intended it to be. The price is obedience and commitment to what the community sees as the divine will. Similarly, the numerous attacks on those who are or were "faithless" to the covenant, function to warn against the consequences of not keeping the covenantal law but also to set the goal of faithfulness.

It is conspicuous that the appeal to "return", שוב, is aimed at individuals and that "return" is within Israel, of a remnant, and not in any way a change of ethnic identity. 11QTemple uses שוב only once. The context is the curse of the exile, the people with a disobedient king (59,1-13) who have broken the covenant. The prophecy is that afterwards they shall turn to God. This serves as a contemporary admonition stressing that there is no salvation unless turning to God takes place with heart and soul. The purpose of a return is primarily to follow God's law.[134] Reward is expressed as "return to the land".[135]

---

[131] Thus CD 2,1-4; 2,14; cf. 1,1-2.

[132] Translation Philip R. Davies.

[133] Translation Philip R. Davies.

[134] Cf. Hans-Aage Mink, *Tempelrullen*, p.111.

[135] Note that the verbal expression is the same, hence there are two meanings of שוב, as return to land and or return to God, which can be termed also as "conversion".

In CD, return is viewed as a return from impiety, sin, and corrupt ways.[136] It involves turning to holiness, a return to God, cf. CD 20,23. Or it is a covenant, an oath to return to the law of Moses.[137] It is noteworthy that the expression, "to return to the covenant", cf. 1QS 5,22, is not found in CD. Instead we find the expression, "enter the covenant".[138]

These occurrences show that "to return" involves a decision to change; it means turning from a life of disobedience to God, to being obedient to the law of God (CD 19,6). Moreover, the most important aspect is the individual human response. Hence to turn from sin means not only to recognise transgression, but also to repent and find forgiveness (CD 4,9) and make a conscious choice to practise covenantal obedience. It follows that such a choice is not a single act but is repeated so that it may be termed repentance. By means of repentance holiness can be restored repeatedly and the boundary to holiness sustained. Because "return" is within the frame of the same covenant and law, it is clearly not a change from one belief system to another; rather it is a change to a certain practice of belief, accepting a new ethical and ritual code.[139]

Since it lies outside the horizon of both CD and the Temple Scroll to envisage a change of ethnic identity, there is no interest in the conversion of Gentiles. This raises the question of those belonging to other belief systems and/or other ethnic identities.

A non-Israelite may be, נוֹכְרִי, a foreigner, and גֵּר, an alien. Israel's relationship with these is either an inter-personal and/or an inter-national problem involving social-religious boundaries and/or national-ethnic boundaries. Basically, as in the Book of Jubilees, Gentiles as nations, as peoples, are to be avoided (cf. CD 11,15; 12,9), and there is no interest in including these Gentiles in Israel. The attitude is one of fear, identifying גּוֹיִם as nations. Because they are a threat on the inter-national level,[140] and

---

[136] CD 2,5; 20,17; cf. 6,5; 8,16; 15,7; 19,29.

[137] Thus CD 15,7, cf. 20,17; and 15,12-13; 16,1-2.4; cf. 10,3.
A return to the law of Moses is clearly understood to be in relation to the teacher of righteousness (CD 1,10-12) who in the past was an interpreter of the law. In line with this the overseer of the camp has the function to cause people to return to the community, or its way of interpreting the law (CD 13,9).
CD 19,16 uses "a covenant of conversion/repentance", בְּרִית תְּשׁוּבָה.

[138] To this I shall return below.

[139] Cf. Herbert Braun, *Radikalismus*, 1969, p.135, who distinguishes between "Torawissen" und "Torapraxis".

[140] This is seen e.g. in 11QTemple 57,11; 58,3 (cf. also 1QM 12,11), but not

on the inter-personal level, there is a lack of acceptance, especially clear in the halakhic part in CD 9-16. The demand for dissociation is grounded in the belief that Gentiles by nature are unclean.[141] These laws reflect the reality of a mixed society consisting of Gentiles and Jews, as well as CD's guiding principle of holiness as goal. Indirectly, this is evidence for a belief in Israel's election, maybe also a belief in Israel's superiority. However, the general rule known from Jubilees, against intermarriage (cf. Jub 30,11-14), is not found in 11QTemple or CD. This may be because it was not an issue or problem.[142] Or more likely, the reason is that the overall concern for identity is not the people's identity, but a narrower group's self-image, in which case both the inter-national and inter-personal relations are set aside for the sake of a narrower self-affirmation. If 11QTemple and CD reflect an eschatological self-understanding, this would explain the lack of concern as part of the eschatological dualism, since on the basis that everything unclean will be destroyed an ideal, pure Israel of the end-time needs to be created.[143]

The status of גר, the alien, the sojourner or the proselyte, is more complicated. In the Old Testament the aliens are the lowest in society, and dependent on the institution of guest friendship.[144] Gradually over the centuries a change from social to religious meaning takes place, so that גר

---

in CD, unless it is presupposed in the demand to free prisoners from foreign people in CD 14,15.

[141] Thus, the laws against spending the Sabbath near Gentiles (11,15), or selling clean animals to Gentiles (12,9) in order that they do not sacrifice them. Or, tolerating Gentiles, so that only in case of self-defence is it permitted to kill a Gentile (12,6).

[142] 11QTemple has a few specific statements, such as the command that the king, must be one of their "brothers", and not a stranger (56,15). And it is further required that the king marry a woman of his father's house, and not a Gentile woman (57,16-17). Soldiers in the king's army must be Jews (57,1-14) who shall protect against foreign attacks as well as protect the king against foreigners.
If a woman is taken as prisoner of war, she may be taken as wife, but she is ritually unclean for 7 years, 11QTemple 43,10-17.

[143] The theme of destruction of evil is prominent in 1QS, 1QM and 1QH.

[144] See for instance Ps 105,12; Jer 35,7; 1 Chr 16,19. They have a status between the Jews inhabiting the land and the strangers, נכרי, which means this is a marginal group, for whom national territorial boundaries do not apply. By living inside the territory of Israel they are subject to the laws governing the land, such as circumcision, to celebrate the Passover (cf. Exod 12,19), keep the Sabbath law (cf. Exod 20,10; 23,12); they may sacrifice, thus have access to the temple (cf. Lev 22,17-33). Consequently, social and religious boundaries are fluid.
For an overview see, D. Kellermann, *ThWAT* I, 1973, col.979-991.

can mean "proselyte", in the sense of a religious convert.[145] This change is reflected in 11QTemple and CD.

Thus, it is noteworthy that in 11QTemple the legislation on relationships with the גר has disappeared.[146] The only time this group is mentioned is in 40,6, regarding restricted access to the temple.[147] This means that the alien has at best retained a marginal social status. There is no hint of a religious boundary to be crossed giving rights of temple access equal to those of born Jews.

CD's use of גר is far from clear. The two instances in 6 and 14 speak to different situations, and to base a conclusion regarding the status of גר on these two instances is highly questionable. In CD 6,21, the context is a list of prescriptions, giving those who have entered the covenant ethical and religious admonitions to show concern for people, apparently outside the community, and of an inferior status. It may be a general rule to take care of anyone in need in a literal sense, which thus, due to its general character, says nothing about inside or outside the boundaries; or maybe the rule should be understood in a context of sacrifice reinterpreted as love, - spiritual, symbolic reinterpretation.[148] In that case it says more of the interpretation of scripture within the community than of its boundaries.

What of CD 14,3-4, in which we find a list with the ranks of the members of the community, "priests first, Levites second, the children of Israel third and the proselytes (גר) fourth"? Or, what of the four groups in 14,6 which are identified as they are ordered for camp meetings?

Unfortunately, the text is not detailed enough to give a definite answer. One possibility is that CD simply alludes to the Exodus event, and refers to a traditional division reflecting a situation in which groups of different

---

[145] This can be illustrated by Septuagint's choice of *προσήλυτος* for גר, cf. K.G. Kuhn, *TDNT* VI, 1968, p.730-44.

[146] On the basis of an comparative analysis of the Deuteronomy laws on the גר, Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, p.172-75, argues that 11QTemple's omissions of this legislation is due to the character of 11QTemple as eschatological law; the eschatological idea of a just society and pure land would have no room for such legislation.
His argument presupposes that 11QTemple builds on CD and develops its ideas.

[147] The temple shall be with a 3rd court (40,5-6) restricting access of the aliens to the other parts of the temple. Thereby their status is equal to women and boys under 20 (39,5-11).
For an exclusion of aliens from the community see also 4QFlor 1,4.

[148] Thus suggested by Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.113.

social background and/or ethnic origin coexist.[149] Another possibility is to take the meaning "proselyte" as a religious convert to Judaism, in which case the community includes both Jews and converted Gentiles.[150] If that is the case it is difficult to explain the lack of interest in boundary marks that proselytes in other contexts are asked to submit to, such as circumcision or confession of the one God, or a similar demand.[151] The fact that strict purity rules are characteristic of the community and that Gentiles are unclean by nature would call for some sort of reference to change of status from unclean to clean, but this is not found. In view of the whole setting of the group within Israel, and its concern with Israel's holiness, it seems more likely that "proselytes" should be understood to be converts to the community from within Judaism.[152] If the community understands itself in terms of the Exodus, the hierarchy of belonging would include the last in rank (and purity?), a marginal group like the "aliens", not yet accepted into full membership. And if גר is a group within the community, then status is indicated. Moreover, this builds on priestly holiness as the leading principle for crossing boundaries, not on a doctrinal system or a new ethnic identity.

In sum, because identity has changed, the expression "all who enter the covenant" identifies a group for whom the choice of covenant obedience is significant. The decision is to live in obedience to the law, commitment to observing the law. With entry into the covenant community characterised by keeping the law, all who, from the point of view of the community, appear to be "faithless" are liable to be excluded. "Return" means change of direction, turning to observance of the law, not change of ethnic identity or belief system.

---

[149] Cf. the lists in Exod 18,25; Deut 29,10-11; Neh 10,1-29.
Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran in Perspective*, 1977, 1982, p.103, suggests that the "assembly of all the camps" (CD 14,3-6) is a reference to a "general convention" held at the annual festival for covenant renewal.

[150] This is the opinion of Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, p.169-70, note 29. In his argument that גר must be religious converts in both 6,21 and 14,4-6 he overlooks the possible link to the Exodus event, and his conclusion is not convincing.

[151] For the view that Hellenistic Judaism attracted numerous Gentiles, that there were different demands in various contexts, see John J. Collins, *Between Athens*, 1986, esp. p.163-68, and the literature here.

[152] See Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.12, but esp. p.122, note 18, in reference to H.H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments*, 1952, p.35-36; P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.56, note 49.

(2) Covenant Markers.

If the decision to study and practise the law is not related to affirming ethnic identity but to a particularistic covenant identity, how then is this boundary crossing marked? Two rites need to be discussed, circumcision and oaths.

(a) Circumcision. In 11QTemple and CD the lack of interest in the rite of circumcision is conspicuous. Against the background of Jubilees this is highly significant. Why is this the case?

The Temple Scroll does not mention circumcision at all. This may be because circumcision is a private rite performed within the family, and not associated with the temple. Or it may be assumed as a universal Jewish practice. If circumcision is taken for granted, this could indicate that belonging is primarily by birth, so that other nations are excluded by definition. Or it could be a reflection of a different perception of how boundaries are drawn. I shall refrain from conclusions based on arguments from silence.

CD mentions the rite of circumcision only in passing or indirectly.[153] The rite is not mentioned in relation to entry, or conversion. Since converts are presumed to be Jews, circumcision seems to be taken for granted. Thus, Jubilees' concern for a rite of affirmation of the covenant seems no longer at issue. The interest has shifted to a demand for a high level of knowledge of the torah and of ethical behaviour; from a rite performed once to repeated ritual affirmations. Entry is not associated with the rite of circumcision nor is there an affirmation of belonging. Whether this is a reflection of the community's acceptance of a traditional covenant mark, or of a community's changed boundary, is impossible to decide due to lack of evidence.

(b) Oaths. Members are accepted as a result of an examination of knowledge and behaviour. This can be illustrated from CD 13,11-13,

> "And everyone that is added to the congregation, let him (the overseer) examine him about his actions and his understanding and his strength and his courage and his property; and they shall write him down in his place according to his status in the lot of light. Let no man of the members of the camp have any authority to bring any man into the congregation against the will of the overseer".

Clearly an examination takes place before the examinee is added to the community. Whether entry to the community is a process or an act of

---

[153] CD 12,11: "the covenant of Abraham". See above in I (1) (e).

immediate decision is difficult to determine. What is clear is that once a person is accepted, a covenant oath is sworn. This seems to be the nearest we get to a rite symbolising entry and/or change. The oath is further mentioned in the legal passages, as "the oath of the covenant which Moses concluded" (CD 15,9) or the "oath to return to the law of Moses (CD 15,12), or rather the reinterpreted law (CD 15,10).[154] It is called the "oath of the covenant" (CD 15,6), and in the context those who can join are either outsiders who wish to join the community and choose to "turn from corrupt ways" (15,7) or those born within the movement, who then swear the oath of commitment to the covenant.[155] There is no mention of a period of trial, but it is perhaps implied, because the examination of knowledge presupposes some sort of instruction. The examination of a candidate (CD 13,11-13) for membership does not mention anything about not accepting a person, nor can we be certain whether there was a period of trial before full membership was granted.[156] Presumably rejection was possible if the applicant did not prove satisfactory (cf. 15,11).

In its present form CD does not provide a liturgical context for the ceremony of entrance or affirmation of covenantal belonging. The unpublished fragment $4QD^{d}$ contains a passage with a liturgy for covenant renewal which presumably takes place at the annual festival of Weeks, as Jubilees suggests.[157] It is quite possible that this fragment could throw light on a

---

[154] Cf. Arvid S. Kapelrud, in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.144-5.
Raymond F. Collins, *EThL* 39, 1963, p.566, interprets the oath as a personal reaffirmation of the Torah and Sinai Covenant.

[155] Insiders can be the sons of the members, who when they reach the age of 20 are able to join, according to CD 15,5-6, while CD 10,6-7 operates with an age limit of 25-60. This age limit is according to Old Testament prescriptions one that is valid for registration to become members of the (male) worshiping community, as well as being the age to go to war, cf. Exod 30,12, or Num 1,2. Levitical service is between age 30 and 50, cf. Num 4,2; or 25 and upwards cf. 8,24.
Similar rules are found in 11QTemple 39,8 with regard to access to the temple. In 1QSa 1,6-19 for membership and duties. In 1QM 6,13-14 the age for soldiers, 30-45 for foot-soldiers respectively 40-50 for riders, is puzzling, and probably reflects membership age or rights within the community, as suggested by Eduard Nielsen in *Dødehavs- teksterne*, 1959, p.170. Age-requirements are not mentioned in 1QS.

[156] For a period of trial see 1QS 6,17.
Unfortunately, CD 15,15 is not intact, but there is a possibility, that this is a reference to a year of trial before the final oath is taken. For this view see Arvid S. Kapelrud in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.144.

[157] J.T. Milik, *Ten Years*, 1959, p.116-17; 151-52.
Milik further argues that the order of the original work behind CD was, (1) CD 1-8; 19b-20; (2) a partly preserved part of $4QD^{d}$; (3) CD 15-16; 9-14, and (4) $4QD^{d}$, containing the liturgy of the covenant renewal. This could mean that the confessional formula in 20,28-29 could be seen as part of either a

ritual entry. However, a final solution to this problem, and to that of a liturgy of covenant renewal, will have to await publication of 4QD[d].

Whether women were accepted or not, is open to doubts. The only passage in CD that could suggest the presence of women is CD 16,10-13, which mentions women swearing an oath. Unfortunately the context is far from clear, so it is impossible to say whether or not the oath is a covenant oath.

In sum, the textual evidence for the existence of a rite consisting of an oath is strong, but absolute certainty for the use of the oath as a ritual that marks entry cannot be reached from the evidence at hand. That an oath together with an examination marks the entrance to the community is at best implied.

(3) Ritual Purity and Washings.

The last point to consider in relation to boundaries is whether ritual purity marks a boundary. Compared to the Old Testament rules, the Temple Scroll's prescriptions for ritual purity are stricter, because priestly purity is applied not only to the temple and priesthood, but also to the city and the people.[158] It would be beyond the scope of this work to go into the variety of laws on purity. Suffice it to say that the purpose of ritual purity and cleanness in 11QTemple is to bring about a state of holiness, a goal which is a prerequisite for the eschatological restoration of the temple and people.[159] Thus the general demand in 11QTemple 47,3-6:

> "And the city which I will hallow by settling my name and [my] temp[le within (it)], shall be holy and clean of any unclean thing with which they may be defiled."

Since the presence of God requires that place and people attain a high degree of purity, boundaries for the presence of God are drawn accordingly. Without having undergone purification no one can enter the holy place.

In CD, ritual washings are mentioned in the context of removal of

---

covenant oath related to entrance or as a part of a rite of covenant renewal. If this is correct then Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.212-13, may be right when she suggests a pattern for entrance into the covenant by oath, with curses, blessings and confession of sins, recalling Deut 27-29. The fragment of a liturgical prayer 1Q34[bis] is a further indication of a festival for covenant renewal.

[158] This may be due to a view that the temple city and mountain have a special status of holiness, rather like Sinai, cf. Exod 19,10-16. Thus suggested by Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* I, 1983, p.285-89.
See also Jacob Milgrom, *JBL* 97, 1978, esp. p.512-18.

[159] For further details and references see Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, 1990, esp. chapter 5.

uncleanness, and there is no specific mention of ritual washings in connection with entrance to a place; this raises the question of whether such removal is necessary for belonging in general. Of special interest is the general rule in CD 6,17-18, "To put a distinction between the unclean and the clean, and to teach the difference between the holy and the common". There is a clear allusion to Ezek 22,26 where the priests are rebuked for not doing what is expected of them. Uncleanness is mentioned in a number of contexts, but is related especially to cult.[160] If covenant identity is defined in priestly terms, priestly functions apply to those who have entered the covenant (cf.6,12).[161] This means further, that when the fundamental ability to distinguish between clean and unclean is in the hands of the community, which sees itself in a priestly covenant, it is then in the power of this community to draw its boundaries, to define who can or cannot enter the sphere of holiness. Thus the priestly community accepts priestly standards and boundaries for itself.

The prescription for purity in connection with community worship is of special interest to the issue of boundaries, because of the link to exclusion. Thus, CD 11,22, "And everyone who enters the house ‹of meeting in order to› pray, let him not come in a state of uncleanness requiring washings".[162] This shows that ritual washings take place not only in preparation for worship in general, but also for worship in the community context. Moreover, when these washings are necessary for remaining in the state of perfection, they become decisive for preserving identity. If cleansing is lacking there is reason for exclusion, and identity is endangered. No prescriptions for purificatory baths are given, except the practical, not to use dirty water, or to use less water than would cover a

---

[160] Thus, uncleanness is used either in a context of cult (CD 5,6; 11,19-20; 12,1; 20,23), or in a context of persons or things, such as dead persons (CD 12,16-18, cf. 7,3), or Gentiles (CD 11,14-15).

[161] Cf. 12,19-20, and 4,18 where "the nets of Belial" are whoredom, wealth and uncleanness.

[162] The term בית השחחות is by some interpreted as a reference to the temple, which is possible because the preceding context speaks of sacrifice. Thus e.g. Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 1991, p.136.
According to Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.158, this interpretation goes back to Israel Levi, Un écrit sadducéen antérior à la destruction du temple, *REJ* LXI, 1911, p.161-205. But Hvidberg also notes that the term CD uses elsewhere for temple is המקדיש, cf. e.g. 5,6; 6,12; 12,1-2. The implication is that בית השחחות must be interpreted as either a type of synagogue, a house of worship for the community.
This is also how Philip R. Davies, *JJS* 33, 1982, p.300, interprets the expression, by taking קהל in its biblical sense of worshiping congregation, and the community itself "as a liturgical unit".

person.[163] When the ritual washings have the traditional function of preparing for worship, rather than signifying entry, the governing principle is holiness, that is priestly holiness. Inasmuch as this principle applies to the communities behind CD and 11QTemple, boundaries are set in narrow terms of priestly purification. Based on the idea that the community exists for the sake of preserving holiness, holiness becomes the principle for all ritual boundaries. Hence, boundaries for belonging are no longer defined according to an ethnic-geographical identity, rather they are defined according to holiness, to ritual norms.

III. Conclusion.

While from the point of view of identity, a covenant relationship is not necessarily exclusive by nature, it nevertheless becomes exclusive when theological, religious, social and national boundaries are drawn. In a similar way as Jubilees interprets the covenant in relation to the past as an eternal covenant for ethnic Israel with national boundaries, 11QTemple understands covenant to be for the people. But unlike Jubilees boundaries are related to the cult, the means for restoring the people's broken relationship, not to an affirmation of the covenant. CD, on the one hand, refers to the idea of the "covenant with the ancestors", in principle given to all Israel, but in practice a relationship entered by human choice rather than through circumcision. On the other hand, since the covenant is a relationship based on faithfulness and obedience, with identity narrowed down to a relationship that builds on obedience, boundaries are set accordingly.

Neither CD nor 11QTemple envisages Gentiles crossing the boundary to Israel. The concern is, at most, for those within Israel who fail to respond, because they, by being uncommitted, risk divine wrath, which may be a risk not only to the unfaithful. Due to the nature of the writings, the real concern is for those who are inside the community, the object being to keep inside those already in the covenant.

When boundaries are drawn according to religious rather than national criteria of identity, such as when the emphasis is on personal choice, on turning from sin, and priestly purity, then a change has taken place from collective election of the people to individual choice. This means that the boundaries are drawn not to mark off the people from the outside world of the Gentiles, but are demarcation lines within Israel. Potentially, Israel

---

[163] This is in another context, CD 10,11-13.

is the object of a call to return to the covenant; in practice, however, only the few who respond are counted as within the boundaries. In this way exclusive boundaries reflect a particularistic identity.

Even if in CD entry into the community is not a goal in itself, visible symbols of crossing are important. When symbolic acts, like the oath, are seen as boundary marks and means for attaining a state of perfection demanded by the law, a change in self-understanding is evident. What emerges is a relatively closed community whose self-image is that of a remnant, called to preserve priestly purity by demanding ritual and ethical obedience and faithfulness. Because the focal point is obedience, mirrored in keeping concrete prescriptions, and based on the theological principle of holiness, there is a change both of identity and boundaries, from an ethnic covenant to a particularistic covenant. Eventually, there is a change in the relationship between God and Israel, or God and humanity.

CHAPTER FOUR.

ECCLESIOLOGICAL AWARENESS AND COVENANT RITUAL IN THE COMMUNITY RULE.

In the preceding chapter on identity and boundaries in 11QTemple and CD I concluded that for both documents the most prominent covenantal aspect is that of obedience. Further, my study of these writings indicated that, compared to Jubilees, the basis of identity has changed from being primarily a matter of birth, to one of choice, with individual holiness as the focal point. Boundaries too were accordingly defined more narrowly. In this chapter I shall pursue these issues further by examining The Rule of the Community, to establish to what extent the same changes are present here. First I shall examine self-understanding by exploring covenantal belonging in 1QS, to see whether identity is defined broadly or narrowly, in terms of an ethnic relationship or a particularistic relationship, and whether a personal choice, not birth, determines belonging. Next I shall look at how boundaries are drawn, what the important boundary signs are, whether they mark conversion or entry to the community or not.

I. Covenantal Identity and Ecclesiological Awareness.

One of the first documents to be discovered at the Qumran site, in cave 1 in 1947, and subsequently published, was the Community Rule, 1QS.[1] This rule, in the form of a handbook for a community, contains a variety of laws, including rules for membership and structure.[2] But whereas CD contains laws

---

[1] There were fragments of the manuscript, presumably older than 1QS, found in cave 4 ($4QS^{a-j}$) and possibly cave 5 (5QS).
1QS was first published by Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, vol I*, ASOR 1950, p.156-92.
The text used here is by Eduard Lohse, and the translations consulted, are by P. Wernberg-Møller; Theodor H. Gaster; *Dødehavsteksterne*, translation and notes to 1QS by Benedikt Otzen; Johann Maier; A. Dupont-Sommer; A.R.C. Leaney; G. Vermes; Michael A. Knibb. See my bibliography, part I, for details.
Unless otherwise stated, the quotations are from G. Vermes.

[2] In its present form 1QS is a composite document, which is clear from the way the content changes. For a brief survey of the content, see Emil Schürer, *History* III 1, 1986, p.381-86, in which G. Vermes gives a summary of the problem of composition.
For the structure I follow the suggestion of Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 1987, p.77-78, who divides the text into six major parts, (1) 1,1-15: Statement of the aims of the community; (2) 1,16-3,12: Entry into the community; (3) 3,13-4,26: Doctrinal teaching of the community, including the teaching of children of light and children of darkness; (4) 5,1-7,25: Rules for structuring the life of the community; (5) 8,1-9,26a: The relationship to Israel including eschatological teachings; (6) 9,26b-11,22: Concluding section in hymnic form. This composition reveals a variety of

related to the community as well as a historical frame, 1QS is remarkable for the absence of historical information.[3] The central and most important point of interest for the document clearly lies in community practice and theology. Unlike CD, a continuity with the past is not expressed in covenantal terms. It is also conspicuous that the term "new covenant" is not found, and that other identity terms, such as *yahad*, seem to be preferred. This raises several questions, Which of the four covenant aspects is the most significant in 1QS: God as guarantor of the covenant? The obligatory aspect? The promissory aspect? Or the aspect of newness? If "new" is absent, how is the aspect of renewal expressed? Does the change in terminology in itself designate a change in self-understanding? If memory and history are not important, is this due to a lack of consciousness of continuity or to a change in the perception of covenant validity? If the latter, What is the principle on which validity is based? Is identity orientated towards the future and hence eschatological? Has the covenant relationship changed from a collective, ethnic relationship to a personal, individual relationship? To answer these questions, I shall order this section as follows, (1) A Priestly Eschatological Covenant and (2) Ecclesiological Consciousness.

(1) A Priestly Eschatological Covenant.

The first thing to note is that when 1QS uses covenant terminology, the covenant concept stands first of all for the relationship with God.[4] This idea of a covenant relationship is to a certain degree shared with CD, but there are important differences to which I shall draw attention under the heading, The Lack of Continuity with the Past. Of particular interest to this study is the idea, which 1QS shares with 11QTemple and CD, of covenant

---

themes that very well could support the theory that several layers have been built into the document as it now stands.
As for genre, there seems to be general agreement on it being a "handbook"; the disagreement is over whether it addresses a monastic type of community at the Qumran site as the majority would maintain, or is a manual for a non-monastic movement with several branches. The latter was advocated already by P. Wernberg-Møller, *ALUOS* 6, 1966-68, p.56-81.

[3] This lack of information makes dating the manuscript from internal criteria difficult. Nevertheless, there is a general agreement among scholars on a date around 100 BC. For a brief survey see Emil Schürer, Ibid., p.383-84.
When 1QS is compared to earlier Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g. 1QpHab), obviously the historical perspective has given way to the theological-cosmological perspective, as observed by Benedikt Otzen in *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.43.

[4] See Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 1960, p.36, who lists 32 occurrences of ברית in 1QS. Thus, 1,8.16.18.20.24; 2,10.12.13.16.18; 3,11; 4,22; 5,2.3.5.8.9 (twice). 10.11.12.18.19.20.22 (twice); 6,15.19; 8.9.10.16; 10,10. Note, that of these occurrences, 10 are in the section concerning entry to the community (1,16-3,18), and 16 are in the section on structure of the community (5,1-7,25).

validity, which I shall deal with under Eternal Covenant.

(a) The Lack of Continuity with the Past. In 1QS covenant theology replaces historical continuity. Since the historical rationale for the covenant is lacking, a significant change of emphasis has taken place in 1QS. I shall now substantiate this statement. First, like CD and 11QTemple, 1QS knows and uses the expression, "covenant of God". Thus, 1QS 10,10, ברית אל[5] and 1QS 5,18.19.22, בריתו.[6] However, this seems not to refer to any particular past establishment of the covenant between God and Israel. Rather the context sets "the covenant of God" in a dualistic scheme, good-evil, or light-darkness, suggesting that "covenant of God" stands for a timeless principle, rather than a historical foundation. This changes the attitude to covenant relationship, inasmuch as some are loved by God, and thus belong to the covenant of God, to the realm of light; while others, by being created evil, are hated by God, and thus belong to the realm of darkness which is to be destroyed in the eschaton.[7]

Secondly, the absence of an awareness of continuity with the past is most obvious, when the idea that the covenant is "remembered", by God or by humanity, is absent. Further, not only is the phrase (familiar from CD), "covenant with the ancestors" absent, but rather surprisingly, so is the idea of a covenant being established with Old Testament figures such as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who do not even appear as examples of behaviour, or as models of obedience, nor in interpretations in which the covenant idea features.[8] The one exception to this is Moses, who is explicitly given the role of mediator of the law (1QS 1,3 and 8,15). But even when the name of Moses is used[9] this is not in a reference to the historical establishment of the covenant, but rather to the legal content of

---

[5] Cf. חוקי אל 1,11 and 3,8.

[6] Hodayot has frequently בריתדה, see e.g. 2,22.

[7] See e.g. 1QS 3,24-26; 4,13-14.

[8] The traditional covenant obligations: circumcision, Sabbath and festivals which were stressed in Jubilees, play only a small role in 1QS. Of these important identity marks, circumcision is mentioned only in 1QS 5,5 (cf. 1QpHab 11,13) in a spiritual connotation referring to repentance within the community. Sabbath and festivals are mentioned in the difficult passage 1QS 10,1-9, but not as covenant obligations nor as blessings, as in Jubilees, rather in a context of practical regulations for worship.
To interpret "hidden things" (1QS 8,11-12) to be an expression for Sabbath, festivals and calendar as Johannes A. Huntjens *RdQ* 8, 1972-5, p.368, does, (also referring to CD 3,13-15) seems an over-interpretation. The context points rather to the interpretation of law as practised in the community, possibly with a teaching of eschatological content in mind. For this last point see Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.83.

[9] 1QS 1,3; 5,8; 8,15.22.

the covenant relationship, stressing the obligatory aspect of the covenant. Thus the phrase in 1QS 5,8: לשוב אל תורת מושה, "to return to the law of Moses", clearly addresses the present community, by being qualified as that which "has been revealed to the Sons of Zadok, the keepers of the covenant".

Thirdly, there is no consciousness of belonging to people whose existence has its origin in a divine establishment of the covenant. No reference to the experiences of the exile as in the opening of CD is found. The history of Israel is referred to only in passing in 1QS 1,21-25, a confession formula which has little or no historical perspective. Thus the liturgical framework and confessional content of both the positive phrases - "the favours of God manifested in his mighty deeds" and "merciful grace to Israel" (1,21-22) - and of the negative phrase, "the iniquities of the children of Israel, all their guilty rebellions and sins" (1,23) do not refer to history. At most there is an allusion to something that belongs to history in general, or rather the history of salvation.

Fourthly, a clear awareness, as in CD, of a common past, of a shared relationship, or fate, uniting present Israel with Israel of past and future, be it in faithfulness or unfaithfulness, is not articulated. Even the term "Israel" seems to be used in a much narrower sense than in CD.[10] When 1QS uses the phrases, "God of Israel" (3,24) and, "the laws of God" (4,3), it could be argued that such phrases indicate that 1QS refers to a belief that is shared with the past. However, it is doubtful whether history is the frame of reference. The perspective seems not to be the consciousness of a shared covenant, but rather the belief in a divine origin of law and order, and therefore a belief in a present validity of God's law.

Fifthly, where CD is conscious of a faithful remnant, seen as heir to the covenant by being faithful, but also in historical continuity, 1QS seems not to be conscious of a remnant within or from Israel.[11] However, when 1QS uses the expression "Sons of Zadok"[12] there is a certain consciousness of continuity; "Sons of Zadok", refers primarily to the awareness of belonging to a priestly line, thereby claiming a priestly covenantal inheritance from

---

[10] As in 1QS 2,22; 6,13; 8,5.9.12; 9,3.6.
For a brief survey of the use of the term "Israel" in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.245-47.

[11] The remnant idea is found in 1QH 6,8; 1QM 13,8 and perhaps 14,9.
In 1QS remnant is only found in context of destruction in which no remnant will be left, (cf. 1QS 4,14; 5,13 and 1QH 6,32).

[12] 1QS 5,2.29. Cf. the play on Zadok meaning "righteousness", in the phrase בני צדק, e.g. 1QS 3,20.22; 1QSa 1,2.24; 2,3; 1QSb 3,22-25.
See also CD 4,1.3; 5,5; 4QFlor 1,17 commenting on Ezekiel.

the past going back perhaps to Phinehas.[13] If this is the case, two things are important. On the one hand the "Sons of Zadok" seem to have a special authority and belong to the leadership of the community though not mentioned in a cultic context.[14] The structure of the community is strictly hierarchical, consisting of priests, Levites and the people (1QS 2,19-21), or, priests, elders, and people (1QS 6,8-9), with the community divided into priests and laity and ranked accordingly. However, there seems to be no difference in rank or authority between priests in general and the sons of Zadok, when 1QS 5,2 is compared to 6,19.[15] On the other hand, as in CD, it is a priestly function to interpret the law within and for the community. Simultaneously to study the law is a duty in which all members of the community need to be engaged.[16] It is, however, noteworthy that the priests are the authoritative interpreters.[17] Whether there is a critique of the established priesthood and cult is hard to see, because an attack seems to be lacking.[18] In spite of a great concern for purity and holiness in 1QS, cultic service is no longer the most important priestly function. Instead, according to 1QS 5,9, the priests' function is to "keep the covenant" and "seek His will".[19] This means the covenant validity, even when interpreted according to a priestly tradition, builds on the principle of law, rather than on history.

When the priestly function is to interpret the law, this may throw light on the meaning of the unique expression, "their covenant". Thus it occurs in 1QS 6,18-20,

> "Then when he has completed one year within the Community, the Congregation shall deliberate his case with regard to his understanding and observance of the Law. And if it be his destiny, according to the judgement of the Priests and the multitude of the men of their Covenant, to enter the company of the Community, his property...shall be handed over to the Bursar of the Congregation".[20]

---

[13] The tradition it builds on is from Num 25,13, in which the priestly covenant with Phinehas is established as an "eternal covenant", see Chapter One, II (4) (a).

[14] See 1QS 5,2.9; 1QSa 1,2.24; 2,3; 1QSb 3,22.
Cf. Jacob Liver, *RdQ* 6, 1967-69, p.28.

[15] Cf. Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.67.

[16] Ibid., p.73. Cf. 1QS 4,2-5.

[17] 1QS 5,20-22, cf. 1QS 2,3; 8,11-16.

[18] Thus Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *CBQ* 38, 1976, p.166-67, notes that the hierarchical-priestly order is presupposed which indicates that their authority and leadership are not questioned.

[19] Translation Michael A. Knibb.
Cf. 1QSb 3,23.

[20] Cf. 5,9 and 1QSa 1,2.

The best way to interpret "their covenant", בריתם, is to take the suffix as referring not to the divine origin, but to priestly establishment, or commitment.[21] Consequently when "the multitude of the men", לרוב אנשי, is qualified with "their covenant" it means not a covenant consisting of priests, rather a covenant based on priestly commitment; priests and lay members together form an authority on community matters, and both have a commitment to study the law and live accordingly.[22] New members joining the community enter in order to participate in a priestly covenantal commitment, a continuous study of the law. In short, the priestly task is primarily to engage the community in a study of the law, the purpose of which is a restoration of the covenant relationship, covenant being understood primarily in its obligatory aspect, its validity based on a legal principle.[23]

Finally, if the consciousness of past history is absent, it cannot occasion surprise that the Old Testament covenantal blessing, of becoming a people and possessing a land, is not the focal point of 1QS. Instead, the covenantal blessings are peace and long life, building on the dualistic principle of goodness and truth and applying the divine promise individually not collectively. Thus 1QS 4,6-8,

> "And as for the visitation of all those who walk in this spirit, it shall be healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness together with every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light."

It is clear that the emphasis has shifted from concrete blessings of place and collective existence, to an individualized reward, which is expressed in future categories.[24] In the perspective of future judgment, reward includes hope of vindication, which is expected when the Messiahs of Israel and of Aaron shall overthrow all evil (1QS 9,11 cf. 1QSa 2,12-22).

Thus, even if the covenant terminology is present in 1QS, the document concentrates its interest on how the covenant is valid for the community in its present form. Rather than giving a rationale for the covenant validity

---

[21] Suggested by Norbert Ilg, in *Qumrân*, 1978, p.257-63.
For a different interpretation see, E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.241, who takes "their covenant" as referring to the priestly founders, and equivalent to "God's covenant". Also Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.146-7.

[22] Thus Norbert Ilg, Ibid., p.263.
For the suggestion that רוב, "multitude", refers to lay members only, and רבים to the whole community, see Hanswalter Huppenbauer, *ThZ*, 13, 1957, p.136-37.

[23] Cf. 1QS 9,3-6.

[24] Note, that there is also the tension between the already and the not yet of eschatological expectations.

from past events, 1QS finds validity in a reference to the two spirits of light and darkness. And from this change one may conclude that the force and dynamic of the covenant concept lie in the ecclesiological usage of the covenant idea and in the application of this to the present life of the community.[25] If a historical dimension is lacking, this raises the question whether the future is a frame of reference. Of particular interest is the use of the expression, "eternal covenant".

(b) "Eternal Covenant". In Chapter Three, I demonstrated that for CD the "eternal covenant" is a priestly covenant. Does the same apply to 1QS? If so, does this further indicate that covenantal identity has changed? There are four passages in 1QS in which the expression "eternal covenant" occurs.[26] Of these, three are in a context where life in obedience brings atonement by means of which the eternal covenant is established; one (1QS 4,22) is in a context of God's final judgment. This could indicate that the community in 1QS has a function that is equivalent to priestly service, and that God's presence is to be found within the community behind 1QS, rather than in the Jerusalem temple. If this is the case then the community sees itself as an heir to the promise and obligation of the eternal, priestly covenant. The question is, What is the rationale for this? I shall approach "eternal covenant" by connecting it with election, both in its ecclesiological meaning and with regard to the purpose of election, in order to explore whether there is a change in self-understanding. Even if the words, בחיר/בחר only occur a few times in 1QS,[27] the terminology, nevertheless, has a theological significance that is worth considering at this point.

First of all, there is clear evidence that God is the subject of election, and also that when the community is the object of election it means it has been set apart as the "eternal possession" of God, as in 1QS 11,7-9,

> "God has given them to His chosen ones as an everlasting possession, and has caused them to inherit the lot of the Holy Ones. He has joined (חבר) their assembly (סודם) to the Sons of Heaven to be a Council of the Community (לעצת יחד וסוד), a foundation of the building of Holiness (מבנית קדש), an eternal Plantation (למטעת עולם) throughout all ages to come."[28]

---

[25] From the perspective of covenant as a vertical relationship with God, E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.270, may be right when stating that the covenant is "the basic soteriological category", but from the perspective of covenant as a horizontal relationship, covenant must be an ecclesiological term. In this perspective, the lack of consciousness of a shared past, and the call for purity, both mirror a particularistic self-understanding of conversionist type.

[26] 1QS 3,11; 4,22-23; 5,5; 8,9.

[27] בחר, cf.1QS 1,4; 4,22; 9,17; 10,12; 11,7. בחיר, cf. 8,6; 9,14 and 11,16.

[28] Other texts testifying to the election by God are, 1QS 4,22; 8,6 and 1QSb

This is part of the concluding section of 1QS, 9,26b-11,22. In a hymnic form the author expresses, in the preceding section, 11,2-5, that God is the source of human righteousness: God is truth (אמת), righteousness (צדקה), justification (משפט) and glory (כבוד).[29] In the following section, 11,14-15, there is an eschatological appeal, a prayer to God who "will judge me in the righteousness of His truth" and who "will pardon all my sins". There is also a reference to the time before the judgment in which all good works and righteous deeds originate from the holy and powerful God according to the divine plan, as a sign of the eschaton.[30] Accordingly, election is set both in an ecclesiological and an eschatological setting. On the one hand, we find that "the chosen" are united with angels to be part of heaven; on the other hand, being chosen means being set apart for God in a community, to form a "council of the community", סודם לעצת יחד, to be God's eternal possession.[31] Whereas the idea that the community is an "eternal plantation" brings associations with the covenant of priests,[32] the "eternal assembly"[33] associates the present covenant relationship with future fulfilment. The covenant is confined to those who choose to accept it, or to live in accordance with its law and will accordingly escape judgment. What thus characterises the community of 1QS is both a future and a realised

---

1,2; 3,23; 1QM 10,9; 12,1; 1QH 14,15; 17,21; 1QpMic 7-9.

[29] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.287-98, who has convincingly shown that in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is an emphasis on righteousness as the grace of God. Grace is referred to alternatively to the righteousness related to human acts. Of note is his point that when the genre is didactic, the emphasis is on exhortations to live a righteous life; when the genre is hymnic, the emphasis is on the righteousness of God.

[30] "All things come to pass by His knowledge; He establishes all things in His design and without Him nothing is done (11,11)."

[31] סוד is used in the Old Testament sense of assembly, sitting together, or consultation, in which it is frequently used in Hodayot. (In LXX The Greek term *βουλῆ* is adopted in Ps 89,8; 111,1 and Gen 49,6.)
Another meaning is "secret", or "foundation", which I choose to disregard as irrelevant, but see e.g. 1QH 1,22.
סוד has both a negative and a positive connotation, thus in 1QH 2,22 the meaning, "assembly of deceit" (or "council of lies", as in Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 1960, p.40-41) and in 1QH 2,10 (cf. 1QS 8,5) "a council of truth and understanding".
In some cases (e.g. 1QS 2,25; 8,5 or CD 19,35) the whole community is in mind, so that סוד seems to be almost identical to בריח, as suggested by Ernst Kutsch, *TRE* 7, 1981, p.404. 1QS 6,19: לקרוב לסוד היחד, seems to suggest the same.

[32] Cf. CD 1,7-8. Here ממעת is used of the faithful remnant, that is to "inherit the land", to receive the blessings of the covenant.

[33] סוד עולמים.
See also 1QS 2,25, 1QH 3,21, and cf. 1QH 4,25, סוד קדושים.

eschatology.[34] When the expression, "those whom God has chosen" is qualified as being "an eternal possession", and as belonging to the sphere of heaven, this reveals a tension between the present existence of the community and its future existence. The same tension between present and future is found in the idea of election of the "upright". To be chosen to realise the "eternal covenant" means that election is seen not only as a present restoration of creation to a status of perfection, but also as the end to the time of injustice. Thus 1QS 4,22-23,

> (After being purified) "the upright may have understanding in the knowledge of the Most High and the perfect of way insight into wisdom of the sons of heaven. For it is they whom God has chosen for the eternal covenant, and to them shall all the glory of Adam belong."[35]

When election is defined to be "for the eternal covenant", this indicates exclusiveness of covenant relationship. The exclusiveness inherent in the idea of a divine election (in both 1QS 11 and 4 cited above) is now transferred to the idea of an eternal covenant.[36] Even if exclusiveness of election is in line with what we find in some parts of Old Testament, the exclusiveness of the covenant is stronger than there. There is in 1QS no indication that God's election for an eternal covenant is an election of Israel to become a superior people, as in the Book of Jubilees.[37] Rather more significant is the idea that God's election is thought of as coinciding with the community as "the elect". Thus, election designates that some are chosen out of Israel, to live a life in obedience.[38] There is, however, no reason to believe that election for the eternal covenant is limited to priests.[39] Further, when 1QS identifies "the elect" with the "upright" by proclaiming that they are the heirs of the covenant (promises and obligations) they claim the covenant in its eternal validity for themselves. It follows from this that ethnic Israel by divine decision may be excluded from a covenant

---

[34] Cf. Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.95, who states that the establishment of the community is a sign that the end time has already begun. Cf. also 1QH 3,21; 4QpPs 37 2,5; 4,12. 4QFlor 1,3-9.
Cf. A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.253.

[35] Translation Michael A. Knibb.
Cf. "eternal covenant" in 1QSb 1,2; 3,23.

[36] Expressed elsewhere in the phrase, "the congregation of the elect", עדת בחירבו, cf. 4QpPs37 2,5; 3,5.

[37] No interest in God's election of a location, such as Zion in Jub 1,17, or a place for God's special presence, is present.

[38] For an election of the people, see 1QM 10,9; 4QpPs 37,4. Cf. also 4QFlor 1,18-19 which refers to the nations over against Israel.
It does not follow from this identification that the community called itself "true Israel", as E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.245, rightly stresses. See ibid. note 19, against several scholars, e.g. G. Vermes.

[39] Perhaps to be found in 1QM 12,1, cf. Eduard Nielsen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.185.

relationship, because neither is all ethnic Israel chosen, nor does it live a life in obedience.[40]

For the sake of completeness, election is not only a divine choice; it is also the individual's response, or an act of conversion.[41] However, the individual's response is to some degree in conflict with election as a divine act.[42] So, if election is viewed primarily as an ecclesiological term, then election of an individual is into membership of a community, which sees itself as fulfilling the obligations of the eternal covenant. Causes of or reasons for election give way to questions of goal and task.

Secondly, it is important to acknowledge that, as in the Old Testament, election is for a purpose, a task.[43] Since election, understood individually as well as collectively, is closely associated with obedience in 1QS, this answers the question of the purpose or goal of the eternal covenant. Thus, the opening paragraph of 1QS 1,1-8, in which the tasks to seek God, to do what is right, to love what God has chosen are also qualified as "the covenant of loyalty or fidelity" (1QS 1,8).[44] Here the purpose of election is

---

[40] This is implied also in 1QH 14,15; 15,23; 16,13; 17,21, but note the fragmentary character of these texts.

[41] The meaning, human choice, is best understood as an individual choice, or turning to God's will as this is revealed to the community. Thus, 1QS 10,12, "I will choose that which He teaches me and will delight in His judgment of me", or 1QS 9,17, "to choose the Way".
For a different emphasis on what election means, see E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.262: "In general, such terms as "choose", "turn" and "despise" figure *significantly* in discussions of how one enters or does not enter the covenant." (My italics.)

[42] When this conflict is viewed as a soteriological problem of divine election and predestination, it turns into a paradox. The dilemma is between the idea that God has chosen some and rejected others, as a consequence of grace, and that humans have chosen respectively the right and the wrong way, therefore may be called the elect. Far from denying that these ideas are to be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly perhaps in 1QH, cf. 1QH 15,19; 16,13, I, nevertheless, find such an interpretation, less satisfactory.
For a discussion see, E.P. Sanders, Ibid., p.257-70, and Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 1963, p.107-11.

[43] Cf. Th.C. Vriezen, *Die Erwählung*, 1953, p.46, quoted above in Chapter One, note 52.

[44] Against G. Vermes, I take ברית חסד in 1QS 1,8 to be more than "covenant of grace", because it contains both promise and obligations, hence "covenant of loyalty or fidelity".
Cf. "troskabspagten" as in Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.46-47 and Philip R. Davies' translation of CD 19,1 where a similar phrase occurs. Further, Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Qumran in Perspective*, 1977, 1982, p.167.

that those elected should be true to the obligatory covenant.[45] Moreover, the validity of the eternal covenant is based on covenant obedience, which is seen in the belief that the establishment of the covenant (8,10) is "according to the eternal precepts".

If election is understood in terms of covenant obligations, then collective belonging implies that the goal of present life is obedience, and from the perspective of future judgment, the hope is eschatological reward. This I see reflected in 1QS 8,5-10,

> "When these are in Israel, the Council of the Community shall be established in truth. It shall be an everlasting Plantation, a House of Holiness for Israel, an Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron. They shall be witnesses to the truth at the Judgement, and shall be the elect of Goodwill who shall atone for the Land and pay to the wicked their reward. It shall be that tried wall, that *precious corner-stone*, whose foundation shall neither rock nor sway in their place (Isa xxviii,16). It shall be a Most holy Dwelling for Aaron, with everlasting knowledge of the Covenant of justice, and shall offer up sweet fragrance. It shall be a House of Perfection and Truth in Israel that they may establish a Covenant according to the everlasting precepts. And they shall be an agreeable offering, atoning for the Land and determining the judgement of wickedness, and there shall be no more iniquity".

This passage contains a number of ideas, both from the point of view of the community's present self-understanding, including its purpose, and of its awareness of its future existence. Two ideas in particular are of concern here.

In the first place, we find evidence for the idea that the purpose of election is related to atonement. Thus, the most important function of the temple, to bring sacrifices and to atone for sins and transgressions, is now a function of the community.[46] That such an expiatory service is related to the community, even when this has the task to "atone for the land", is clear also from 1QS 9,4-5.[47] However, where atonement in the Old Testament took

---

[45] A similar reference to election is found in 1QSb 1,2, "The master shall bless them that fear [God and do] His will, that keep His commandments, and hold fast to His holy [covenant], and walk perfectly [in all the ways of] his [truth]; whom he has chosen for an eternal Covenant which shall endure for ever". Here the purpose of election is clearly obedience.

[46] For the discussion of the imagery of the community as temple, I refer especially to e.g. Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 1971, p.41: "Der wahre Tempel ist die Gemeinde selbst; auf sie werden die Tempelbegriffe übertragen angewendet". For a detailed analysis see Ibid., p.50-93. More recently, Hermann Lichtenberger, in *Approaches* II, 1980, p.159-71.
See further, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *CBQ* 38, 1976, p.159-77, esp. p.165; Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.159; E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.298-303 and Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.37.

[47] "They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain lovingkindness for the Land without flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice. And prayer rightly offered shall be acceptable

place in and through literal sacrifices and was for the whole people of Israel, atonement seems now to be limited to the community (cf. 5,6-7) and is by means of the spirit.[48] Because the atoning function has the purpose of guaranteeing purity and holiness of the community, atonement no longer concerns the people of Israel.[49] This does not mean that atonement is simply "spiritualized",[50] as if prayers or faith are substitutes for sacrifices. Rather, it seems that the reinterpretation of the cult sees the most important function of atonement to be to maintain holiness in a real and concrete way.[51] This is clear when the community sees its goal to establish purity or holiness, to "set apart a House of Holiness" (1QS 9,6). Thereby the goal of and conditions for membership coincide. Members are to practise legal obedience, to "preserve the faith in the land with steadfastness and meekness" (1QS 8,3). Or, in the abstract radicalised demands, to practise "truth, righteousness, justice, lovingkindness, and humility" (1QS 8,2). In this way the validity of priestly service is not only maintained within the community, but it is also reinforced, because priestly holiness is both internalised and given wider application. When 1QS is read in this perspective, the conclusion is that a temple-centered cult has changed, or has been particularised. Its purpose of securing the cultic holiness of the people has changed its scope: the cultic service functions to preserve holiness within the narrower community; when a covenant is established by humanity (1QS 8,10) and based on priestly principles of purity, covenantal identity is particularistic..

Secondly, 1QS 8,5-10 testifies not only to atonement having changed its purpose but also to a change in the role the human partner plays in the covenant relationship. A change has taken place, from a relationship between

---

fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering."

[48] Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.48, seems to take "atonement for the Land" literally, but he has overlooked the context that clearly refers to the community, in which case "land" refers to the community.
See E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.323-27. Also Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.82; *Judaism*, 1990, p.153. Hermann Lichtenberger, in *Approaches* II, 1980, p.163.

[49] Stressed by E.P. Sanders, Ibid., p.303.

[50] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *CBQ* 38, 1976, p.159-61, points to the difficulty in using the term, "spiritualized", because of its many different meanings, spiritual being either in opposition to institutional cult, or to a secular, outward reality.

[51] Thus the priestly ritual washings function not only as symbols of cultic purity, but also as symbols that establish boundaries for the sphere of holiness in a concrete way as I shall argue below, section II.

God and ethnic Israel, to a particularistic covenant relationship. This is clear from the metaphorical language, "Everlasting Plantation", "House of Holiness for Israel", "Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron", "tried wall", "precious corner-stone", and "a most holy Dwelling for Aaron", "House of Perfection", and "Truth in Israel", all of which refer to the community, and in a particular way call to mind the priestly covenant commitment.[52] How do these metaphors relate to the priestly eschatological covenant? What seems most significant is that these expressions refer to what is expected of the human partner in the covenant relationship. By using terms for priestly purity and holiness, the emphasis has changed, stressing both covenantal obedience and a status of perfection rather than belonging by birth.

In sum, the consciousness of the past is almost eliminated in 1QS, and when present, it is at best ambivalent. From a theological perspective, 1QS has the present covenant as its central focus, and the most important covenant aspect is that of obedience. The group's self-understanding builds on the conviction that the community has as its purpose an atoning function, to reach perfection. Election is reinterpreted so that being chosen means being obliged to live according to the law and being devoted to the study of Torah. Because the eternal covenant in 1QS is interpreted in priestly categories with atonement as its primary characteristic, and because the community sees the eschatological overthrow of the realm of darkness having already begun with the practice of obedience in the community, the covenant concept has to a large degree been transformed. What 1QS seems to imply is that the covenant is built on a timeless legal principle, rather than a relationship between God and humanity in past, present and future.

(2) Ecclesiological Consciousness.

So far I have dealt with self-understanding as this is based on the covenant idea, founded partly on dualistic eschatological ideas, partly on priestly identity and purpose. At this point I wish to deal with identity as this is reflected in a terminology of a different type. The question is, Does the community behind 1QS see renewal of the covenant relationship as its purpose? I have already mentioned that the expression "new covenant" is absent in 1QS.[53] Besides this, the limited use of the word חדש in 1QS is

---

[52] The metaphors refer to a large extent to building categories, cf. CD 3,19, and the implication of this is probably that the community applies the temple language to itself. Besides, the emphasis on holiness is striking. Both these issues point to the underlying idea of exclusive identity, conversion and separation. Cf. Johann Maier, *ZAW* 72, 1960, p.160-62.

[53] Apart from CD, "new covenant" is found only once in the main texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in 1QpHab 2,3. This text also mentions the teacher of

striking.[54] It is, however, not possible to conclude from an absence of these terms, that the idea of renewal is also absent. The question is in what sense does renewal feature?

It seems appropriate to draw attention to some other terms, more or less in common use in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in order to clarify the relation between identity and renewal. First, it is significant, particularly in view of its later adoption in the New Testament, that the term קהל is not used in 1QS.[55] This points to a different interpretation of continuity to Old Testament terminology from that of the later Christian community. It further indicates that continuity with ethnic Israel is not established in this particular terminology, probably because continuity is based on covenantal obedience within a narrow community. A similar idea of obedience may be behind the use of the term, סרך.[56] For whereas סרך in CD stands for the order of the torah, in 1QS it stands for the order of the community.[57] Because the term has this double meaning, it is possible to argue that the interpretation of סרך should build on both meanings, community order and the new law and order on which the community is built.[58] If this is the case, the double meaning could also reflect a change in self-understanding, stressing not only the perspective of obedience, but also the idea of newness. The use of סרך may reflect the idea that a priestly community has the authority both to give new laws and to interpret traditional prescriptions in a new way.

This point can be further illustrated by the interpretation of the divine

---

righteousness who here is said to speak the word of God against the unfaithful of the new covenant. Thus the content is similar to CD, the text is however not intact.
Cf. Chapter Three above.

[54] As adjective it occurs only in 1QS 4,25, in a reference to "new creation", cf. 1QH 13,12.

[55] It is in frequent use elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, thus, 11QTemple 16.15.16.18; 18,7. 26,7.9; CD 7,17; 11,22; 12,6; 14,18; 1QSa 1,25; 2,4; 1QH 2,30 and 1QM 4,10; 15,10.

[56] The term is not prominant in the Old Testament, but may have a background in Hellenistic terms. It designates both the rules of the community and the community based on these rules.
See for this, Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern*, 1986, p.10; A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.124-125.

[57] See 1QS 1,1; 5,1.23. 6,8.22. Cf.also 1QSa 1,21.
CD 7,6; 7,8 has סרך התורה juxtaposed to משפט האסרים meaning the order, which contains the law, cf. also 12,22; 13,7; 14,3; 19,2-4. סרך has the same meaning as *τάξις*, cf. Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden*, 1928, p.115; A.R.C. Leaney, Ibid., p.124; Moshe Weinfeld, Ibid., p.13.
The term is not used in 11QTemple, but frequently in in 1QM, e.g. 3,3.16, here particularly of a military order.

[58] Stressed by Moshe Weinfeld, Ibid., p.10.

command to love.[59] In 1QS the language of love and hatred applies first of all to God, secondly to people, but in both cases seen in a dualistic perspective. The foundation for the love command is that God loves those who live according to the law;[60] moreover, God hates evil, or those who are subject to evil.[61] The command to humanity is consequently, to "love all that He has chosen and hate all that He has rejected";[62] to hate falsehood and to love truth;[63] to engage especially in "eternal hatred" for the "people of perdition".[64] Further, it is to engage in love towards "the children of light", or the members of the community.[65] There is no mention of love for enemies because the enemy is seen as the adversary of God. Thus, the interpretation of love turns into a double command, to hate and to love, attributing a dualistic principle that is <u>not</u> found in the Old Testament in this form.

Secondly, the important expression in 1QS 5,5-6, ליחד ברית עולם, "a foundation of truth for Israel, for the community of the everlasting covenant", poses another problem of self-designation. Here, one of the most characteristic terms in relation to identity in 1QS, יחד, *yahad,* is used. As a noun it means "union", as an adverb "together".[66] It is significant that this term is used more often than ברית in 1QS.[67] While it is not used as a term for community outside the Dead Sea Scrolls, it may have been adapted

---

[59] Lev 19,17-18 is alluded to in 1QS 5,26-6,1, but the context refers to rebuke, hence different.

[60] Thus 1QS 3,26; cf. 1QH 14,10.19.26; 15,10; 16,13; 17,24; CD 8,17; 19,30; 20,21.

[61] See 1QS 4,1; cf. 1QH 14,25; 15,19; 17,24; CD 2,13.15; 8,18; 19,31.

[62] 1QS 1,3-4, cf. 1,9.

[63] 1QS 2,24; 4,2-4; 9,17.

[64] 1QS 9,22, cf. 1,10.

[65] 1QS 1,9, cf. CD 6,20. Also expressed as "lovingkindness" in 1QS 2,24; 5,4.25; 8,2; 10,26; cf. CD 13,18.

[66] Old Testament usage is rare, and not in a context of identity; see e.g. Deut 33,2 using the noun, or Ps 86,11, using the verb, in piel, "unite". Both noun and adverb are frequent in 1QS, the verb less so.
For references to 1QS and CD, see Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz,* 1960, p.87-89. (11QTemple only has the adverb, e.g. 57,13.)
For full studies of the concept and its use in the Dead Sea Scrolls see particularly, Johann Maier, *ZAW* 72, 1960, p.148-66 and P. Wernberg-Møller, *ALUOS* 6, 1966-68, p.56-81.

[67] Conversely in CD, where only CD 20,1.14.32 attests to the usage.
Some translators take CD's היחיד as adj., in the sense of "unique". Thus Chaim Rabin and Flemming Friis Hvidberg render 20,1.14 as "unique teacher", and 20,32 as "men of the community". The alternative translation, "teacher of the community" is used by G. Vermes, Philip R. Davies and Michael A. Knibb, cf. Eduard Lohse, "Lehrer der Gemeinschaft".

here under the influence of the Greek κοινωνία. Its frequent use in 1QS and variety of meanings point to the importance of the term, stressing union, unity or togetherness.[68] Nevertheless, there is no evidence that it is employed as a proper name.[69] Rather, there seems to be a deliberate use of יחד in the context of a community, stressing that the community is united in ideology as well as practice, in a common cause and with a common goal.[70]

Yahad may be qualified as יחד אל,[71] as יחד קודש,[72] as בריח יחד עולמים,[73] or as יחד אמת, thus in a language similar to the covenant language and with the same consciousness of present and future identity. The community members are called "people of the community", אנשי יחד,[74] or "multitude of the men of the community", רוב אנשי היחד,[75] to be distinguished from the "many", הרבים.[76] It is of note that particularly in relation to acceptance of new members, to expulsion or punishment of present members, the *yahad* has a status of authority, which is clear from the expression, עצת היחד, the "council of the community".[77] This council is either its governing body; or it is the whole community gathered for decisions. However, the language is far from transparent. In short, since the use of יחד as a term designates union and unity, it points to another way of expressing the awareness of being a community created from, but also within, the wider ethnic Israel. By being a parallel term to covenant it reflects a self-understanding that makes a point of using a different terminology than the one used in the Old Testament. It testifies to a narrower type of ecclesiology than one defined

---

[68] Thus P. Wernberg-Møller, *ALUOS* 6, 1966-68, p.56-81, esp. p.70.

[69] Shemaryahu Talmon, *VT* 3, 1953, p.133-40, repr. in *The World*, 1989.

[70] P. Wernberg-Møller, Ibid., p.70-71, maintains that יחד is not a term for "a clearly defined religious sectarian body". Rather it seems to refer to a "reform movement" within Judaism with an emphasis on law observance. Further, p.61, he argues for membership not of one community but of a *local branch* on the basis of 1QS 6,13ff. (Italics mine.) See below in II (2) (b). Johann Maier, *ZAW* 72, 1960, p.150 points to the theological understanding of יחד and denies that there is a reference to organization, cf. 1QS 2,26; 3,7 and 9,2.

[71] 1QS 1,16; 2,22.

[72] 1QS 9,2 and 9,7-8, cf. 1QSa 1,9.

[73] 1QS 3,12, cf. 5,5, יחד בריח עולם.

[74] 1QS 5,1; 6,21; 7,20; 8,11.16; 9,5.7.10.19.

[75] 1QS 5,2-3; 6,19.

[76] As mentioned above in (1) (a), רבים refers to priests and laity, thus 1QS 6,1 and frequently, also CD 13,7; 14,7.12; 15,8. The Greek translation of this is either πλῆθος, or οἱ πολλοί, according to Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern*, 1986, p.14-16, cf. Josephus, Bel.Jud.II, 146.

[77] עצה, council (counsel), seems in some instances a parallel term for community, see Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.47.

by ethnic principles.

To sum up. The covenant concept that has here been described in a context of identity builds on the idea of a priestly hierarchical structure, of priestly holiness and purity. Thus we find a much narrower understanding of covenant relationship than in both the Old Testament and Jubilees. However, especially when other terms for self-understanding in 1QS are taken into consideration, this reflects also a change of identity. Emerging clearly out of a national identity, a particular religious group is conceptualized. No longer are the people, or the land, the objects of interest, or the focus of covenant blessing. This change of identity is particularly obvious when יחד is adopted as a new term for identity. By means of this change of terminology 1QS signals a different identity. No longer is the important factor national identity; rather it is shared religious belief and practice. Whether this reflects a movement for reform of the wider society, or an internal renewal with no impact on national and religious identity, is difficult to assess from the material at hand. However, it raises questions about the definition of boundaries for belonging, especially about the characteristic rites affirming covenantal belonging or symbolising a transformation of identity.

II. Priestly Boundaries and Entry.

Having established that for 1QS the consciousness of belonging to a priestly eternal covenant is fundamental, and that identity thereby is more narrowly defined, I shall now examine the implications for boundary-definition under two headings Purity and Impurity, and Entry into the Community. When ritual washings are practised, do they signify a change of status? the crossing of a boundary? or, entry? And what, besides ritual washings, is important from the point of view of boundaries? Who are accepted into full membership? How is it obtained? Is there one rite which functions as an entrance rite? or as an affirmation of belonging? All these questions originate in self-understanding, and the answers will help establish whether the boundaries in 1QS reflect a broad self-understanding, or a narrow identity.

(1) Purity and Impurity.

As in CD and 11QTemple, 1QS reflects the Old Testament attitude that ritual washings are a means of removing uncleanness/impurity, even when this is caused by sin, as well as being needed before approaching the holy.[78] But

---

[78] According to Gedalyahu Alon, *Jew, Judaism*, 1977, p.190-234, such a general attitude to ritual and moral cleanness as well as the specific demands for persons engaged in the cult can be found in writings contemporaneous with the Dead Sea Scrolls.

where CD expresses concern with the uncleanness of the outside, 1QS focuses on those within its community.[79] And where 11QTemple's main concern is with cultic purity, 1QS emphasises much more the uncleanness caused by sin or wrong behaviour. One of the characteristic features of purity/holiness in 1QS is the tendency to restrict the possibilities for purification to members of the community. This leads to boundaries set around the community, not only because they are purity-related, but also because knowledge of sin is given within the community. And when the means to deal with uncleanness are within the community, the community stands out as a group independent of ethnic Israel with its traditional means of purification. Outside the community, there is no possibility of purification, which can be illustrated from 1QS 3,4-6,

> "He shall not be reckoned among the perfect; he shall neither be purified by atonement, nor cleansed by purifying waters, nor sanctified by seas and rivers, nor washed clean with any ablution. Unclean, unclean shall he be. For as long as he despises the precepts of God he shall receive no instruction in the Community of his Counsel".

Boundaries are defined negatively by those inside the covenant. To be outside is to be outside the covenant in the narrow sense as interpreted by the community.[80]

This text is part of the crucial passage of 1QS 2,25-3,12, dealing with purification by water and by spirit, having covenant as a frame in 2,26 and 3,12. 1QS 2,25 stands as an introduction containing a rejection of those who "walk in the stubbornness of the heart".[81] And the conclusion of the passage, 3,10-12, emphasises that those inside are accepted by virtue of being able to "walk perfectly". The implication of this is that unless the right attitude is present, purification rites are useless, and no restoration to holiness can take place. Finally, we note that the most important elements here for restoration to holiness are purification by atonement, by water and

---

[79] Because sin is also understood as moral defect, visible in behaviour inside the community, it becomes vital that sin in this sense is repeatedly forgiven within the community.
However, this idea of sin does not exclude that sin is also thought of as a power, hence related to darkness.

[80] Cf. E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.243-44, 270: Those outside are e.g. "the wicked", because they are opposed to the covenant.

[81] A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.136-37, interprets this passage as a denunciation of those who refuse to enter the covenant. But it seems too narrow, to take "those who refuse" as those who after probation refuse to enter, as he does.
P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.60, takes the passage to be non-polemical, as a lesson delivered to members before taking part in the water rites which were part of the covenant renewal.

by the spirit.[82]

First water. What is the significance of ritual washings in 1QS? Apart from being the means to remove uncleanness caused by sin,[83] they serve a positive function as a means of purification, consecration.[84] In the quoted passage, 1QS 3,4-5, there are three expressions which interpret purification by water: "cleansed by purifying waters", "sanctified by seas and rivers", "washed clean by any ablution".[85]

On the one hand, this points to the function of the ritual washings as means of removing both ritual and moral impurity.[86] The washings are means by which a person's body, whether defiled by sin or unclean for other reasons, may be purified. Although, as the context shows, a prerequisite is repentance/conversion - that is commitment - there is no attempt to spiritualise the ritual washings. Instead we find the idea that ritual washings are of no value unless repentance/conversion is present. Hence ritual washings serve as rites that mediate forgiveness (for moral sin and impurity), although sin

---

[82] As shown above in I (1) (b), atonement plays an important role in 1QS because of the priestly influence, even when reinterpreted as atonement within the community.
It is of note that the atoning function in 1QS has not priests but God as subject, cf. 1QS 2,8; 3,6-8; 11,14 (further 1QH 2,13; 4,37; 11,30-31). See Bernd Janowski and Hermann Lichtenberger, *JJS* 34, 1983, p.31-62, esp. p.47-48.
The appeal to God's righteousness in 1QS 11,14-15, is an appeal to God's purificatory power. That the righteousness of God brings atonement has been observed by Paul Garnet, *Salvation*, 1977, p.73-81; see also E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.305-12.

[83] Thus A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.139, referring to David Flusser: "Ritual acts cleanse from ritual defilement, repentance from moral defects. The sect is the first group within Judaism, of whom we know, who believed that moral failure (sin in a modern sense) incurred ritual defilement. They taught that to be cleansed from sin demanded both repentance and ritual purification.

[84] The rites make fit for worship, hence serve as rites of consecration, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, *NTT* 56, 1955, p.37-39.

[85] The Hebrew terms are a) זכה to purify, to be clean has a moral connotation and is parallel to צדק; b) טהר to become clean (used twice), with a physical and a moral connotation; c) קדש, to sanctify.
The means for purification are respectively atonement, כפורים; water, מי נדה; seas and rivers, ימים ונהרות and water of ablution, מי רחץ.
מי נדה was originally used in reference to menstrual uncleanness (Lev 12,2; 15,19-20; 18,19 Ezek 22,10) but a different meaning, referring to water in general, is also found (cf. Num 19,10.13.20-21). This latter, general use of water for removing uncleanness is what 1QS refers to, cf. 4,5.
מי רחץ is not a concept from the Old Testament, but is used in context of the body and its ablution, cf. Lev 16,4.24, see P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.60 and A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.142.
Note the absense of טבל, which translates into Greek *βάπτειν*, *βαπτίζειν*.

[86] See Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.31; Peter Steensgaard, in *Dåben*, 1982, p.18.

is ultimately forgiven by God.

On the other hand, the text testifies also to the positive use of purification. Just as water in the Old Testament is the symbol priests use in preparation for the encounter with the presence of God, so the ritual washings in 1QS serve as symbols for preparing for entry to the sphere of holiness. It is, however, important to bear in mind that water is only one of the elements of restoration to holiness.[87]

When these two meanings are taken together, ritual washings become symbols of status, either by being symbols for crossing the boundary from unclean to pure, or by preparing for holiness. Because they are practised within a closed community of converted Jews they become associated with belonging inasmuch as their validity depends on right attitude. Conversely, wrong attitude causes both sin and impurity, and characteristic of those who are outside, without access to purification. From the perspective of boundaries, the point to note is that boundaries are drawn, first of all, according to right or wrong attitudes.

Secondly, spirit. In the same context of 1QS 2,25-3,12 purity is also a purification by spirit. The body that is defiled by sin may be cleansed by water, but the spirit too has a cleansing function, because eventually sin is atoned for by God. This is clear from 1QS 3,6-9,

> "For it is by the spirit of God's true council[88] that the ways of man, all his sins, are atoned, so that he can behold the light of life.
>
> It is by the holy spirit of the community in His truth, that he can be cleansed of all his sins.
>
> It is by an upright and humble spirit that his sins can be atoned.
>
> It is by humiliating himself under all God's ordinances, that his flesh can be cleansed, by sprinkling with water of purification, and by sanctifying himself with water of purity."[89]

The structure of this passage clearly has four parallel expressions

---

[87] Stressed by Peter Steensgaard, Ibid., p.17. See also David Flusser, *Jud* 39, 1983, p.3-18, esp. p.11.

[88] The Hebrew is עצה, which G. Vermes, A.R.C. Leaney and Michael A. Knibb translate counsel when used on its own, cf. 1QS 1,13; 6,4.9. 8,18; 9,2.17; 11,22. The expression עצת היחד, meaning the council of the community, is either the governing body of the community, cf. 8,1, or the community gathered for decisions, as in 3,2; 5,7; 6,3.10; 7,2.22.24 and 11,8.
The precise meaning is difficult to determine. A play on both meanings, council and counsel, is a possibility, cf. the use in 1QS 1,8.

[89] Translation by P. Wernberg-Møller.

introduced with "it is by"; all four have verbs for atone/purify.[90] In three of the cases the purification is caused "by the spirit", and, in the fourth, purification is by water.[91] The question is, what is meant by "the spirit"?

If the human spirit is meant, then a distinction between inner and outer purification of the human being can be made.[92] Thus Otto Betz[93] regards outward purity as given through daily washings of the body, and inward purity as given through the spirit of God. Somewhat similarly, B.E. Thiering[94] claims that there are two locations of sin, a primary one related to the "inner man" and a secondary one related to "the flesh".[95] Consequently, she conceives of an inner purification through "a rite of cleansing with the spirit" along with "a washing of the outer man"[96] which is "not real entry but was associated with entry."[97] From this she concludes that there are two separate rites of initiation, actual initiation, where the spirit purifies the interior; and a washing of the exterior with water that cleanses from sin. Only in the future will the two rites become one.[98]

Both Betz and Thiering's arguments seem to be based on a dualistic anthropology where outer flesh and inner soul/spirit are contrasted. A dualistic anthropology of Hellenistic origin would allow for such dichotomy, and also provide the basis for two rites of purification with an inner and an outer cleansing. Such Hellenistic influence cannot be excluded, cf. 1QS3,17-18. However, the traditional Jewish anthropology that accepts the body as "a living soul" (Gen 2,7), or the body as created, is also present in 1QS, e.g. in 11,2-15.[99]

---

[90] The Hebrew terms are כפר and טהר, both used twice, and alternatively; further קדש used for sanctify.

[91] Thus the means of purification are, a) the spirit, רוח, used three times; b) water, מי נדה; מי דוכי; c) humility, בענות נפשו, which by some is translated as "his soul's humility", see A. Dupont-Sommer, Eduard Lohse and Benedikt Otzen.

[92] Thus Peter Steensgaard, in *Dåben*, 1982, p.20.

[93] Otto Betz, *RdQ* 1, 1958-9, p.213-34, esp. p.217; repr. in *Jesus*, 1990.

[94] B.E. Thiering, *NTS* 26, 1980, p.266-77, and *NTS* 27, 1981, p.615-31.

[95] p.268-69 in *NTS* 26, 1980.

[96] Ibid., p.270.

[97] Ibid., p.270.

[98] Ibid., p.273. She further associates the two rite respectively with the office of priests and the office of Levites, cf. p.274.

[99] Cf. also 1QH 1,21-2,7.
Hermann Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 1980, p.183, interprets the creation of humanity in the "Qumran literature" as "Niedrigkeitsdoxologie" and as "Elendsbetrachtungen", claiming that the presence of evil is not due to a negative power of Belial, nor to a dualistic nature, but to createdness.

If, however, the spirit, in 3,6-9, is the spirit of God, purification by the spirit is associated with holiness. A possible illumination of this passage can be found in 1QS 4,20-23 where the context is eschatological, and where the relation is to the end of the period of evil and to the time of judgment.

> "Then God will purify all the doings of man by His truth and purge a part of mankind. He will utterly destroy the spirit of deceit from them and clean His flesh by a holy spirit from all ungodly acts. He will sprinkle upon it a spirit of truth like water of purification, from all the abominations of falsehood and (from) being polluted by a spirit of impurity, so that upright ones may achieve insight in the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of Heaven, and the perfect in way become wise. For those has God chosen for an eternal covenant, and theirs is all the glory of Adam, without deceit."[100]

This passage is far from clear, because it seems to contain two ideas mixed in one concept.[101] On the one hand 4,21-23 contains the idea of purification after the judgment by the holy spirit, and a destruction of the spirit of deceit. Only a part of humankind is to be purified.[102] The last sentence in the quotation testifies to an expectation of a restoration of the community, chosen by God to be a new creation. On the other hand we find also the idea of the presence of the spirit before the end, in an interval in which the righteous will be taught knowledge by the spirit, and the spirit of truth thereby bring purification.[103] This shows that God is an agent of purification, and that the spirit must be the spirit of God to be sent before or at the end time.[104] From the point view of an eschatological purification by a bestowal of the spirit,[105] some would conclude that here there is an allusion to "spiritual baptism".[106] However, this is a possible interpretation only if

---

Thus he states, "Diese Problematik, das Gott selbst durch seine Schöpfung die niedrige Befindlichkeit hervorgerufen hat, wendet sich nun nicht gegen Gott, sondern gegen den Menschen. Sie dokumentiert sich in seiner Unfähigkeit zu rechten Wandel, zu Heilserkenntnis und zum Lobpreis, eben jeden Komponenten, in denen der Mensch erst seine wahre Bestimmung hätte".

[100] Translation by P. Wernberg-Møller.

[101] For the following interpretation I depend on Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.65.

[102] P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.85, has pointed to the allusion to Mal 3,3 where the sons of Levi will be purified at the day of the coming of the messenger of the covenant. The significance of this is, that "the sons of Levi" is replaced in 1QS 4,20 by "a part of humankind" which is with the community in mind.

[103] For a study on the spirit, see F.F. Bruce, *ALUOS* 6, 1966-68, p.49-55.

[104] Cf. Mal 2,17-3,5 and Joel 3,1.

[105] Cf. F.F.Bruce, Ibid., p.54.

[106] For this see P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.86.
When David Flusser, *Jud* 39, 1983, p.11, uses the phrase "baptism with the spirit", this seems rather an anachronistic term in the context of 1QS.

purification and baptism are the same thing. From what has been said above, it is perhaps not how the texts should be understood. Suffice it to stress that both passages are ambiguous, which makes the interpretation of the spirit equally ambiguous. Even if the aspect of purification is found, it is not possible to associate the purification with one act. I conclude that purification by the spirit of God is only one of the elements of purification which brings about the state of purity/holiness and which is necessary for establishing the holiness of the community rather than individuals, and for maintaining the boundaries between the holy inside and the profane outside.

To sum up. Purity in 1QS is mainly a quality of the community referring to the future, the eschaton. If 1QS 3,6-9 is set alongside 3,4-6 the question of purity and impurity may be addressed by interpreting purification as preparation and consecration for the presence of God within the community. However, only the eschaton will bring "peace, blessing, glory, joy, and long life of all the sons of light" (1QM 1,9), all of which can be interpreted as the presence of God. To ensure such a presence in the contemporary community, ritual (and moral) purity becomes an objective by which its goal of maintaining a relationship with God is achieved. Purity is a status, the prime condition for preserving a place for the presence of God until the final judgment and entering a place of holiness. Consequently, purification serves as a boundary mark.

(2) Entry into the Community.
Because ritual washings are necessary for maintaining the holiness of the community, and because purity rites seem to be part of the discipline in 1QS, this raises the question whether there are also specific rites related to entry, to crossing a boundary of belonging. It is noteworthy that there is no scholarly agreement concerning the function of the water rites, particularly in relation to the significance of the first of the ritual washings as an initiation rite.

A classic interpretation of the water rite as entrance rite is found in Otto Betz's study on various types of baptism.[107] On the basis of 1QS 3,4-9, which I quoted above, Betz claims that the community practises a baptism of initiation. Thus, for Betz, the first ritual washing of the person who enters the covenant is modeled on some sort of proselyte baptism.[108] On

---

[107] Thus he uses "proselyte baptism" in his interpretation of the "Qumran community". See *RdQ* 1, 1958-59, p.213-34, repr. in *Jesus*, 1990, p.21-48, in which he adds a postscript with new evidence for his case.

[108] Thus *RdQ* 1, 1958-59, p.218: "Wenn sie von der rechten Reinigung handelt,

entering the covenant a person belongs to those who are "willing to enter", but is not a full member. A decisive factor for full membership is the probation period (cf. 1QS 6,14-18) during which a candidate is examined, both with regard to a theoretical and a practical knowledge of the Torah.[109] Betz further reads 1QS 3,4-9 as a parenetic discourse that addresses the matter of entrance. This does not mean that the emphasis is on an outward symbol. On the contrary, it is very much on commitment, in the sense of turning from sin and turning to the truth, as the community understands it. This interpretation has been questioned by some and accepted by others, as we shall see below,[110] but the fact that Betz can introduce new evidence clearly shows that baptism as initiation against a Dead Sea Scroll background is still an issue.

Since I look at the issue of ritual washings from the point of view of boundary crossing I shall limit myself to the following questions: (a) Is the reference to "entrance into covenant" equivalent to "entry into the community"? What does it mean? (b) Who are the novices? And, What is the function of the novitiate? Is it to introduce a candidate to a new lifestyle of purity thereby preparing for a change of status? (c) Does the first of the ritual washings function as an act of initiation? (d) Are the ritual washings in 1QS equivalent to proselyte baptism? And (e) Are there marginal groups that are included, excluded or remain marginal?

(a) Entry to the Covenant or Covenant Renewal? As in CD, the most frequent use of covenant language is found in relation to the expression, entry into the covenant.[111] Since, as demonstrated above, the covenant established by God

---

so ist es wahrscheinlich, das der Bundeseintritt mit einer Art von Proselytentaufe verbunden ist: der neueintretende erhäll ein erstes Bad."

[109] Ibid., p.218, "Dieses Bad (Proselytentaufe) hat nichts mit der täglichen Waschung vor dem Mahl zu tun, von dem der Novice auch nach der Eintritt in den Bund für zwei Jahre ausgeschlossen bleibt (1QS 6,20f.)."

[110] Especially in (c) and (d).

[111] The terminology for entering is either בוא constructed
a) with בריח, in 1QS 1,7-8; 2,12.18; 3,11-12; 5,8.20; 6,14-15; 10,10; (cf. 1QH 5,23; 18,24.28);
b) with סרך היחד, in 1QS 1,16. Cf. 1QH 3,22; 14,21;
c) with עצת יחד, in 1QS 3,2; 5,7; 8,21. Cf. 1QH 6,5;
d) with עמוד לפנל הרבים, in 1QS 6,15 and
e) with קהל, in 1QSa 2,4.
Besides, common is also the use of the root עבר with בריח, cf. 1QS 1,16.18.20.24; 2,10.11.
This terminology for entrance frequently expresses entrance to the community, using the noun יחד. Thus constructed with בוא in 1QS 1,16; 2,26; 3,2; 5,7 (cf. 1QH 3,22), or with יסף (1QS 6,14; 8,19), or with קרב (1QS 6,16.19.22).
The verb יחד is used in a context of unity in 1QS 1,8; 5,20; 9,6.

is replaced by one of human establishment,[112] and since the covenant relationship seems to be more narrowly defined, "covenant entrance" needs to be examined from the point of view of whether this narrowness is reflected in the setting of boundaries. Talk of "entering the covenant" appears in the liturgy in 1,16-2,18 which consists of three parts: first, a recital of God's righteous deeds towards Israel by the priests, along with a recital of Israel's sins in the past by the Levites, concluding with a response from those entering the covenant; secondly, the priests' blessing of those who are "members of the lot of God", the Levites' curse of "the men of the lot of Satan", to which those entering the covenant bless and curse in response; thirdly, the priests and Levites curse those who enter under false pretences, and a double Amen from those entering the covenant conclude the liturgy. Finally, 2,19-25 gives a prescription for order and rank of those entering with the demands for an annual ceremony: "Thus shall they do, year by year, for as long as the dominion of Satan endures". This shows that it is a matter of interpretation whether this liturgy should be understood in terms of a rite of entry or covenant renewal.

The two terms in this passage, בוא ברית,[113] and עבר בריה,[114] both express a movement, either in a literal sense - a change in space - or in a transferred sense - change of status. Is the use of the two terms in one statement more than a stylistic difference? Or are there two meanings, different even if only in nuance? A comparison between the two concepts suggests that they are not equivalent, even though the nuances are small. Unless there is a different nuance between בוא, ("enter" or "come into"), and עבר, ("enter" or "pass over into"), one seems superfluous. The difference is best explained as due to different liturgical functions.[115] Unfortunately, it is not clear whether this passage refers to covenant renewal or to covenant being established by entry once only. In the latter case עבר is the technical term for a first establishment of the covenant

---

[112] Cf. 1QS 5,20 and 8,10. See above p.146-47.

[113] 1QS 1,7.11.16; 2,12.18.25; cf. 1,11.16 with יחד.
This phrase is well-known from CD and from 1QH. See Chapter Three, II (1) where I pointed to בוא with a double meaning, a literal and a figurative crossing with cultic overtones.

[114] 1QS 1,16.18.20.24; 2,10.
This phrase from Deut 29,11 (MT) is peculiar to 1QS, H.F. Fuhs, *ThWAT* V, 1986, col.1030, suggests that Deut 29,11 "enter the covenant" means affirmation of the Moab covenant, which in the context may be a replacement for the Sinai/Horeb covenant, thereby עבר in a sense stands for a renewal of covenant commitment. However, he is not certain that there is a ritual commitment, nor whether it reflects a Deuteronomist theology associated to Israel's guilt and subsequent confession.

[115] In allusion to Deut 29,11 (MT).

with God or the liturgical act in which the promise to keep covenant obligations is made; and בוא is the term with a wider sense, suggesting that a separation from the world outside takes place. However, it is difficult to determine whether the nuances in meaning are substantial enough to justify a sharp distinction between "to enter" and "to pass over into" the covenant in an unrepeated act, based on the two verbs.[116] Another possibility is that the text describes a liturgical occasion on which the community as a whole affirms covenantal belonging by renewing it.[117] Because the choice in the liturgy is between "the reign of God" and "the reign of Belial", this indicates that members make the choice not only once, but repeatedly, for the sake of affirming belonging to the reign of God. If the occasion is a covenant renewal, the ceremony may be taken in the context of a festival associated with covenant establishment.[118] Since the liturgy contains a strong condemnation of those outside the covenant, and a curse on those who enter under false pretences, it is evident that boundaries are at issue. But whether boundaries are marked once only on entry, or repeatedly in an annual event is difficult to decide from the evidence available.

Another aspect of entry may be found in 1QS 5,4-11, referring to the demands of those entering the community. Parallel to CD 15,12-13, it is said of those who separate from the congregation of falsehood, that all who have "freely pledged themselves to the house of Truth", to enter the community, כול הבא לעצת היחד, "shall practise truth and humility in common". On joining, each must swear "a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses" (5,8-9). This passage, like 1QS 1,16-2,18, continues with a demand for separation from outsiders (1QS

---

[116] A passage like 1QS 5,7-8 speaks against this distinction, since בוא is used of both entry to the community, עצת היחד, and of entry to the covenant, ברית אל.

[117] Thus Matthias Delcor, in *Qumran-Probleme*, 1963, p.109-34, esp. 109-16, who suggests that the formula "passing over into the covenant before God" belongs the liturgy of covenant renewal.
P. Wernberg-Møller, *ALUOS* 6, 1966-68, p.79, note 31, makes the same distinction, taking עבר to refer to "a communal, cultic act by which members pledged themselves to certain religious and ethical obligations" (in reference to Delcor). For בוא he suggests "make a promise" (cf. Jer 34,10) in the context of admittance to יחד.
For a different view see, W.H. Brownlee, *Von Kanaan*, 1982, p.295-302, who suggests that עבר stands for a physical movement and a spiritual change. His hypothesis that a crossing of the Jordan takes place on the occasion for the annual renewal of the covenant is less convincing.

[118] The likely occasion is the Festival of Weeks, as in the Book of Jubilees, which has been advocated by Mathias Delcor, *BiLe* 4, 1963, p.188-204; Bent Noack, *ASTI* I, 1962, p.73-95, esp. p.89.
P. Wernberg-Møller, *StTh* 9, 1955, p.40-66, esp. p.47, opts for the Day of Atonement because of allusion to Lev 16 and 23 in 1QS 3.

5,11-20). Since it is assuming in this passage that those who wish to join do so by "freely devoting themselves", or "pledging themselves", the emphasis is on the initial free choice; moreover, on dedication and commitment.[119] However, there is no indication as to when or on what occasion the oath is sworn, whether the context is that of an annual liturgy for covenant renewal or on entry. It is of note that there is no mention of oaths in the context of renewal. It is possible that the oath is sworn when a candidate enters into the community, as in CD 15,12-13, marking the individual's affirmation of covenantal commitment; hence the oath might be related to a change of status.[120] However, I find no clear textual evidence for the use of an oath as a boundary mark symbolising a first change of status. Rather, 1QS seems to underline the process of entering, as we shall see below. Does this mean that there are several boundaries to be crossed in this process of entering?

Similarly to CD, 1QS presupposes that individuals make a commitment, or "conversion", phrased as a "return" from and a "turning" to, such as in the expressions "return from evil", "return from wickedness" or "return from sin and transgressions";[121] "return to the covenant",[122] "return to the law of Moses",[123] or "return to the truth".[124] It is noteworthy that 1QS states that water rites are not valid except in a context of "conversion". However, 1QS never refers to Gentiles or foreigners entering the community as a "return" or "conversion". Neither of these groups are mentioned in 1QS. Commitment is first of all visible as a desire to join the community, and because it is associated with attitude and precedes entry to the community, it is not an

---

[119] Of interest is the special use of hitp. participle of the root of נדב, meaning "devote" (cf. Wernberg-Møller) or "pledge" (Vermes), which 1QS denotes attitude, free choice and commitment, of those who wish to join the community. See 1QS 1,7.11; 5,1.6.8.10.21.22; 6,13.
This term is generally overlooked as identity term, but is important from the point of view of what a free choice to join the community means. It has a priestly, cultic context of sacrifice, and when used in a context of recruiting (1QS 6,13-14) it seems to refer to consecration. Used in and by the community as a self-designation it refers to a group of dedicated priests who through perfect lives are a "sacrifice" for God, like an atonement, therefore see themselves to have both a special dedication and status. See to this P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.65; A. Fitzgerald, *CBQ* 36, 1974, p.495-402.

[120] See Arvid S. Kapelrud, in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.140, who stresses the importance of the individual choice.

[121] 1QS 5,1.12; 10,20. Cf. also the frequent use in 1QH, thus 2,9; 6,6; 14,14; further 4QpPs 37 2,3.4.

[122] 1QS 5,22, cf. 1QH 14,21.

[123] 1QS 5,8.

[124] 1QS 6,15.

act of entry.

From this I conclude that 1QS 1,16-2,18 gives evidence for an annual liturgical event that is used to mark covenant belonging, since this occasion marks a boundary between inside and outside the reign of God. There is no clear evidence that the liturgy was a ritual for initiation: an annual covenant renewal is more likely. Further, 1QS 5,7-11 indicates that an oath somehow plays a role to mark covenant commitment ritually, but unless oaths are repeated, for which there is no evidence, they do not mark a covenant renewal.

(b) Entry for Novices. Decisive for understanding what boundary crossing is, in terms of entry into the community, are the questions as to who the novices are and whether a change of status takes place. In order to answer this I shall turn to 1QS 6,13-23, which clearly shows that the community operates a probation period of at least 3 years.[125] During the first year the candidate is not considered a full member of the community, for it is specified that after a year an examination of insight and conduct takes place before a candidate is accepted as a member.[126] Initially this is done by the guardian; later the council of the community decides. This indicates that entry is a process. Thus 1QS 6,13-16,

> "Anyone, born of Israel, who freely pledges (נדב) himself to join (אסף) the Council of the community (עצת היחד), shall be examined by the Guardian at the head of the Congregation (הרבים) concerning his understanding and his deeds. If he is fitted to the discipline, he shall admit (בוא) him into the Covenant that he may be converted (לשוב) to the truth and depart from falsehood; and he shall instruct him in all the rules of the Community (היחד). And later, when he comes (בוא) to stand before the Congregation (הרבים), they shall all deliberate his case, and according to the decision of the Council of the Congregation (עצת הרבים), he shall either enter (קרב) or depart (רחק)."[127]

---

[125] Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.75, states "at best more than two years". Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 1957, p.3, operates with four stages of the novitiate, a pre-novitiate of indefinite duration followed by two years of novitiate.

[126] The practice of examination is parallel to CD 13,11-13. See Chapter Three, II (2) (b).

[127] The Hebrew terms for entry vary here. Thus, 6,14 has the niphal יסף (6,14, cf. 8,19), which in Vermes's translation is, "join", but the neutral "approach" is more correct. See Matthias Delcor, in *Qumran-Probleme*, 1963, p.116-17.
בוא in 6,14 is probably with the future of full membership in mind. Delcor takes the term to be liturgical.
קרב, in 6,16 is better translated as "bring near" or "admit" (cf. also 6,19.22; 7,21; 8,18; 9,15). The verb is used in 1QS a) of novices (1QS 6), b) of inclusion in cases of disciplinary inclusion/exclusion (1QS 7 and 8) and c) of purity in 1QS 9,15. Delcor (p.118-23) suggests a cultic origin, cf. Exod 3,5; Lev 21,21; Ezek 40,46. Evidence for the parallel use of קרב in a context of admission into the Pharisaic הבורה from Rabbinic sources is given by Saul Lieberman, *JBL* 71, 1952, p. 199-200.

Apart from an examination following instruction on discipline or the rules of the community, no other act of commitment is mentioned. The candidate is, if found acceptable, admitted to the covenant with the purpose of turning (to the law) which the use of לשוב shows.[128] Admittance to the covenant must here be taken in a wide sense of being accepted by the community, since the context shows that the initial turning to the covenant differs from full membership of the community.[129] Entry to the covenant is marked initially by an examination of knowledge and deeds, which serves to determine whether a candidate is "fitted to the discipline". In order to be fully accepted both a dissociation from those outside the covenant and a commitment to obedience within the covenant community is required. Full membership, however, is yet to be decided.[130] How the community reaches a decision on acceptance and entry of the novices is not specified.[131] No other act of commitment is mentioned in this context, but it is possible that either water rituals or an oath was used.[132] No evidence for the use of a symbol of acceptance is found.[133]

The significance of the examinations seems to be, that acceptance of new members is not just by means of private and individual examination; rather, acceptance is a public affair of the community. Rules for exclusion are listed in 1QS 6,24-7,25 pointing to exclusion as both possible and likely,

---

E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.301, following A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.211, takes "to join" and "to enter" to be equivalent. If this is the case, the difference in vocabulary is due merely to a tautological style. However, it is impossible to determine with the material transmitted whether there is a difference in meaning, whether there is a distinction between full or partial membership, or between a liturgical or legal usage.

[128] See above p.138.

[129] Cf. 1QS 2,24-25 according to which members are expected to live a life in a "community of truth and virtuous humility of loving kindness and good intent one towards the other".

[130] Examinations are repeated after the second year (cf. 6,21) and contain questions related to self-understanding of the community, see 6,15.18.21. For suggesting that this passage is legal in character, see Matthias Delcor, in *Qumran-Probleme*, 1963, p.117-18.

[131] 1QS 6,16 and 22 suggest a casting of lot, as a likely interpretation, but, if literally, it is not clear how it was carried out. See Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.51; A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule*, 1966, p.166-67. P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.92-3. 108, takes the phrase figuratively.

[132] Cf. 1QS 5,3. This is the standpoint of Arvid S. Kapelrud, in *Bibel und Qumran*, 1968, p.139. See above in (a).

[133] Laying on of hands does not occur in the Dead Sea Scrolls except in 11QTemple 15,18 in a context of ordination. See Ove Conrad Hanssen, *Handspåleggelsens funksjon*, 1987, p.30.

probably as disciplinary action during the process of entry.[134] Further, since both conduct and insight are questioned in the novitiate, the examinations serve to secure submission to the discipline, teaching, and both moral and ritual obligations of the community. The question is whether the existence of a probationary period, with a gradual introduction (6,15) to the rules,[135] indicates that novices undergo a gradual change of status, or whether there is a single change of status at a specific stage in the process.

On the one hand, it is clear that novices, during the process of entry, pass through stages of purity, achieved by repentance, washings, study and being repeatedly examined. By showing an understanding of the rules and by practising them, novices may reach one of the final stages, and be included in the meal of the community. The last stage for a novice is when his property is absorbed into common ownership.[136] This interpretation is based on 1QS 6,16-23, particularly the context related to admittance to the "purity of the Many", "the drink" and "purity".[137]

On the other hand, if one takes overall theological self-understanding into

---

[134] For a study that deals with exclusion, see Göran Forkman, *The Limits*, 1972, esp. p.51-64 on 1QS.

[135] Cf. the ethical rules in 1QS 5,7-22 for joining the community.

[136] According to 6,17 the property is not shared at the early stage; the property is recorded after the first year (20) and merged after the second year (22).

[137] Thus the novice in the years of probation is respectively excluded from טהרת הרבים 6,16, משקה הרבים 6,20 and טוהרה 6,22. Cf. also 1QS 4,5; 5,13; 6,25; 7,13.16.19.25; 9,17.24 and CD 9,21.23.
A variety of interpretations of these expressions has been suggested, and ranges as follows:
(a) A narrow meaning of water-rites, cf. Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 1971, p.111, with a reference to 5,13; Mathew Black, *The Scrolls*, 1961, p.96; André Dupont-Sommer, in *Qumran*, 1981, p.263-75, esp. p.266.
(b) Pure food, cf. Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 1957, p.6-8; Joseph M. Baumgarten, *HThR* 46, 1953, p.141-57, esp. p.148; Laurence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 1983, p.164.
(c) Pure meal of the community, cf. Saul Lieberman, *JBL* 71, 1952, p.199-206, esp. p.203.
Finally, (d) a broad interpretation of purity as such, cf. Göran Forkman, *The Limits*, 1972, p.56; Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.11-26. Since Newton, interprets the term in a context of the community that sees itself as preserving the cultic purity of the new temple, whose purpose it is to protect from pollution in general, he relates purity to the admission of new members.
As I read 1QS its context does not allow for an interpretation that takes purity as only one of these elements. For instance, if an exclusion from the purity means exclusion from the water purification for a full year, then the point is that "conversion" becomes a separate act, and as a result there is a dichotomy between inner and outer sin. Therefore, "exclusion from the purity" is best taken in relation to grades of membership, or to ranking of members, in other words, the disciplinary means by which the community keeps its standards high, and its boundaries narrow.

consideration, assuming the aim of the community to be the attainment of perfection in the presence of God within the community, then reaching a state of perfection is the goal and purpose for all members.[138] It is therefore likely that the novitiate too has as its purpose to go through stages towards perfection, each stage probably introducing a different grade of ritual and moral purity by which a person is qualified, or ranked.[139]

From this I conclude that there is no clear indication that examinations are associated with a rite of entry for novices. Moreover, there is no clear evidence as to the time and occasion on which they were used. Whether they bring about a change of status cannot be answered on the evidence available. The way I read the text suggests that a change of status refers to a gradual process towards the ultimate goal, with perfection as its final stage.

(c) The First of the Ritual Washings. I shall now consider the argument put forward by Betz about the first of the ritual washings. Although it is possible to assume, with Betz,[140] that the first washing had a special significance as an act of initiation, different from daily washings, the problem is whether 1QS actually provides sufficient evidence for such an interpretation. Even if Betz is right, there is still the possibility that the first of the washings did not mark a decisive change of status. The first question is, Is there a justification in 1QS 2,25-3,12 for proposing an initiatory character for the first of the ritual washings?

Betz's proposal that 1QS 2,25-3,12 is a sermon aimed at novices, is not altogether convincing.[141] Against Betz I shall propose that when the sermon is

---

[138] The purpose of joining the community is to live perfectly, cf. 1QS 1,8; 3,10-11; 5,7-22; and 11,2.10-11.18 (1QH 4,29-33).
According to 8,1-2 the quality of the twelve men and the three priests (those constituting the council of the community) is specified as "perfectly versed in all that is revealed of the law"; their works must be "truth, righteousness, justice, loving kindness, and humility". There is no reason to believe that these demands are limited to the leaders, cf. 8,20-21 and 2,24, as does E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.323.

[139] On ranks within the community see 1QS 2,19-23; 5,23-24; 6,8-9; 7,20; 8,19; 9,2; and further 1QSa 2,14.

[140] Cf. Otto Betz, *RdQ* 1, 1958-59, esp. p.216-20.

[141] Cf. Ibid., p.216-19. Here he argues that because the "inner" cleansing is more important than water cleansing, and that, because both the spirit and the truth (equal to the Torah) are forces (Kräfte) of inner cleansing, this sermon is addressed not to members who over the years have been tried in the truth, but to novices. To them, the sermon functions as a warning against a magical understanding of the ritual washings, emphasising that inner cleansing is more important than water rites. "Return" brings purification. In *Jesus*, 1990, new evidence for this argument is taken from the fragment, 4Q 370, cf. *RdQ* 1988, a parenetical address with a promise of salvation (righteousness) to those who turn from sin to God.

addressed to those who "refuse" to enter the covenant, it addresses the issue of renewal, not initiation.[142] If my interpretation of the liturgy is correct, this passage refers to covenantal renewal in general, and the particular reference to purification shows that three things are necessary: an act of commitment, bodily cleansing in water and cleansing by the spirit.[143]

The question following from this is, Is there evidence in 1QS 2,25-3,12 for a change of status attached to the first ritual washing? Or is it just one rite among many necessary for full membership? If the first of the ritual washings is one among many, all of which are part of a process, aimed at reaching a higher "rank", then the initiatory character of the first would not have been acknowledged. If, as I have argued, full membership is reached gradually through practising purity with perfection as its goal, and with members ranked according to insight and purity, it follows that a member's status may be reduced to that of a novice if he fails to submit to the community's discipline. Likewise, a higher status may be reached by following the discipline strictly. This means that the status of a member is not simply defined as either outside or inside.[144] Precisely because a member's status, or rank, is being questioned and evaluated all the time, there seems to be a change of status more than once, and more than one boundary needs to be crossed.

Thus, I conclude that the significance of the first of the ritual washings must not be over-emphasised. If this rite is one among many, decisive but perhaps not the most decisive of them all, the reason is that its foundation and origin lie in the priestly purity rites. Its present character is as both a covenant ritual and a commitment rite.

(d) Dependency on a Proselyte Baptism. The main thrust of Betz's argument is that there is a relationship between 1QS's baptismal rite and proselyte baptism.[145] Against this I would maintain that it is highly questionable and

---

[142] This point has been made by Joachim Gnilka, *RdQ* 3, 1961-62, p.185-207, esp. p.190.
See also H.H. Rowley, in *New Testament Essays*, 1959, esp. p.221.

[143] The suggestion that there were two separate rites of initiation, dealing with two types of uncleanness, put forward by B.E. Thiering, *NTS* 26, 1980, p.270-71, is less convincing, because 1QS stresses that the validity of purification is dependent on right attitude, which seems to emphasise a process of belonging over against a rite of entry.

[144] A change of national, ethnic status is not considered in 1QS.

[145] Thus *RdQ* 1, 1958-59, p.218: "Das Bad, das der "Willige" beim Bundesfest erähllt, lässt sich der jüdischen Proselytentaufe vergleichen." Betz refers here to the Talmud, Bab. Yebamoth 47, in which the demand to keep the Law is

problematic to build an argument on proselyte baptism, which is not mentioned in any Jewish writing prior to the Rabbinic material.[146] This is in itself surprising, and may be explained in more than one way. Since no clear evidence for a contemporary use of such a rite exists, one could equally well point to a reversal of influence. Another argument is from internal criteria. The fact that 1QS itself never refers to the juridical change of status that one would expect is surprising.[147] This points to a qualitative difference between ethnic-religious boundary-crossing from outside and crossing a priestly purity-boundary within ethnic Israel. In conclusion, while I acknowledge that the water rites reflect a priestly purity because they are concerned with purification I do not see enough evidence on which to build a case for dependency on proselyte baptism. From the point of view of the history of religion, there is, at most, a possibility, not a certainty, for such a parallel use of a ritual for entry.

(e) Qualifications for Entry. It is clearly presupposed that, to qualify for membership of the covenant one has to be born a Jew (1QS 6,13, cf. 5,8-11), although not all born Jews necessarily qualify. It is against this background that the absence of references to circumcision is to be seen. Why is circumcision not an issue in 1QS? Does the silence on the rite of circumcision mean that circumcision is not a mark of the covenant? When circumcision is mentioned once in 1QS 5,5 (cf. 1QpHab 11,13), the most striking feature is that 1QS uses metaphorical language, setting circumcision in

---

tied to entry to Judaism.
Of interest is the new evidence he brings from fragments in 4Q, cf. *Jesus*, 1990, p.47-48. Of note is the phrase "on day of his purity" (ביום טהרתו) which he interprets as a reference to the time of entrance of the proselytes. This is the same occasion as the renewal of the covenant for members, the festival known from Jubilees.
Betz has been criticised for his views on proselyte baptism, for instance by Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.30-31, but from the point of view of its influence on John the Baptist's baptism. Further by Michael Newton, *Purity*, 1985, p.28-29, from the point of view of purity. His criticism of Betz concerns the dichotomy between ritual and moral purity in 1QS 3,4-9.

[146] For details on the Rabbinic material I refer to Bernhard J. Bamberger, *Proselytism*, 1968, esp. p.38-59.
For a classical debate on this see Joachim Jeremias, *ThZ*, 5, 1949, p.418-28; and *Infant Baptism*, 1960, p.24-40 opposed by Wilhelm Michaelis, *Jud* 7, 1951, p.81-120.

[147] This point is made by Joachim Gnilka, *RdQ* 3, 1961-62, p.191: "Die Paränese kann sich unmöglich auf eine Proselytentaufe beziehen, denn ein Initiationsritus ist nicht nur ein sakraler, sondern auch ein juristischer, nur in Gegenwart von Zeugen gültiger Akt, während die hier beschriebenen Waschungen gerade die Möglichkeit bieten, selbständig, privat geübt zu werden, und oben vor den Waschungen ausserhalb der Gemeinde wird gewarnt." (In reference to Johann Maier, *Die Texte II*, 1960, p.17.)

relation to conversion.[148] The phrase "circumcise the foreskin of evil inclination" refers to repentance as a condition for entrance, the required response necessary for belonging. Thus the expression implies an identity that builds on choice, not birth. By being alluded to in metaphorical terms, circumcision becomes both internalised and reinterpreted as a "conversion rite". What is important in both cases is choice, for good as opposed to evil, for the covenantal obligations as opposed to the sin of not keeping the law, for truth as opposed to falsehood, for light as opposed to darkness.[149] In this way 1QS disregards both birth as an identity mark in general, and circumcision as a covenantal mark in particular, and stresses the importance of individual choice, by emphasising that the choice is one between the two principles that govern the universe.[150]

Another question is, Does 1QS's view of circumcision mean that it is not a symbol of purification? In the overall picture I have drawn of the community I have also shown that the boundaries exclude sin and uncleanness/profanity, against which purity rites serve the purpose of restoration to cleanness/holiness. Recurring moral and ritual contamination require repeated restoration rites. If this is the view, then there is no room for a once-for-all rite like circumcision. This does not mean circumcision plays no role. Since the Jewish background is so self-evident, one must keep in mind that the practice of circumcision can be maintained, even when the rite does not mark the crossing of a boundary. It serves no special purpose in the context of the community, mainly because of the priestly character of covenantal identity. Since identity is related to a narrowly defined priestly covenant commitment, the repeated purification rites function as boundary markers to those outside the covenant, but more so to those within. Whereas circumcision, by being an unrepeatable rite, has a different rationale, and contains a different symbolism, it may function as a boundary between Jews and Gentiles, but not as a boundary mark expressing an ongoing choice between principles.

It is in line with this that entry to the covenant, as interpreted by a community of priests who practise priestly purity within closed boundaries, may be refused to some, even of those born within ethnic Israel. It seems

---

[148] See R. le Déaut, *Suppl. VT* 32, 1981, p.178-205, esp. p.193: "A Qumrân, le thème de la c. du coeur est donc employé pour illustrer les conditions *morales* d'une vie de perfection dans l'alliance nouvelle." (Author's italic.)

[149] See above in (a).

[150] To enter the community is to turn away from "stubbornness of the heart" as in 1QS 1,6; 2,14.26; 3,3 and 5,4.

logical to assume that because of its priestly ethos, the community would pursue an interpretation of Old Testament laws - particularly those against accepting anyone with physical defects to the priesthood[151] - and would apply them to itself. However, 1QS does not explicitly mention physical defects as grounds for exclusion. The strong emphasis on perfection points to a possibility that handicapped people would not be accepted into full membership. The silence could, on the other hand, be due to 1QS having a broader application among ethnic Israel than other texts such as 1QSa and 4QD^{d} in which exclusion of the marginal is made explicit.

Excursus on Marginality. 4QD^{d} contains the clearest statement of who cannot enter the community. Thus,

"Fools, madmen, simpletons and imbeciles, the blind, the maimed, the lame, the deaf, and minors, none of these may enter the midst of the community, for the holy angels (are in the midst of it)."[152]

Uncleanness is in all these cases caused by handicaps, physical or mental, by being abnormal they fall under the category of "imperfection", lack of holiness. These handicaps are, as in Lev 21,17-32, the reasons for exclusion from priestly service. Similar demands are found in 11QTemple 45,12-14.[153] However, the significance here is that priestly purity is applied to a wider group, while more groups are excluded from entering the sphere of holiness, and boundaries are drawn accordingly and strictly.

Another example can be found in 1QSa. This text is in many ways related to 1QS but seems to have a different identity.[154] This document shows that exclusion is on the grounds of physical defects, thus 2,3-9 runs:

"And no man smitten with any human uncleanness shall enter the assembly of God; no man smitten with any of them shall be confirmed in his office in the congregation. No man smitten in his flesh, or paralyzed in his feet or hands, or lame, or blind, or deaf, or dumb, or smitten in his flesh with visible blemish; no old and tottery man unable to stand still in the midst of the congregation; none of these shall come to hold an office among the congregation of the men of the renown, for the Angels of Holiness are with their congregation."

From this it is clear that any person who is unclean by virtue of any physical defect cannot belong to this community, let alone hold office there. The main reason for exclusion is given with reference to the

---

[151] Cf. Lev 21,17-21; Deut 23,1-8.

[152] Quotation from J.T. Milik, *Ten Years*, 1959, p.114.

[153] Cf. also the exclusion in 1QM 7,4-5.
The presence of angels implies holiness, as in Jub 2,18 where the command to keep the Sabbath concerns both Israel and angels in heaven.

[154] The most conspicuous difference is in the self-designation. The most common expression in 1QSa is "community of Israel at the end of days", (עדת ישראל באחרית הימים) as in 1QSa 1,1. According to Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 1960, there are 21 occurrences of עדה in 1QSa, whereas only two in 1QS. יחד is also used in 1QSa, but only in 8 instances.
It is however difficult to determine which of the documents are the older of two.

presence of angels, and thereby to the presence of holiness.[155] Since the uncleanness/impurity caused by physical defect cannot be removed ritually, those who are classified as unclean/impure cannot reach a status of perfect purity. They are instead forced to maintain their status as marginal.[156] However, they are not totally excluded. According to 2,10 they have a channel to the community, allowing them to approach privately. By implication their moral status could be one of purity, but this is not the issue. Another reason for keeping the marginal excluded is that the community behind 1QSa probably sees itself as the locale in which purity guarantees the presence of God. Keeping "the land" in a state of holiness serves as a preparation for the eschaton; clear boundaries excluding uncleanness/impurity are essential, because they maintain the holiness of the place.

Marginality is further related to women. 1QS lacks specific references to women and this again is basically due to a priestly interpretation of covenantal commitment. 1QS sees its purpose as building a community that has perfection and holiness as more than a future eschatological goal. women are therefore regarded as unclean and imperfect, by definition abnormal.[157] Women, and other imperfect beings, are not only incapable of being holy, they are also regarded as a source and cause of pollution.[158] Thus, when 1QM 7,6-7 states that no imperfect person is allowed to enter the camp of war, the reason given is that the war is a holy war, in which holy angels participate in the combat of evil; the implication is that the congregation of holy men and angels (e.g. 1QS 11,7-8) has no place for women.[159] How the purification at the time of the eschaton will affect women is not mentioned, probably because this is not an issue to be taken seriously.[160]

---

[155] The motif that the present community consists also of heavenly beings who participate in the worship of the community, is parallel to 1QS 11,7-8; see, also 1QH 3,21-22; 6,12-13; 11,10-14; 1QSb 4,26.
Parallel is also 1QM 10,10 and 12,1-4 referring to angels in the context of the final war against the evil (cf. 12,8).

[156] E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, interprets the exclusion in terms of salvation, which gives a different conclusion, as on p.243: "Such people were probably not counted among the damned, but were excluded only from certain community functions." From the point of view of belonging to a community, I take both exclusion and marginality as terms referring to not being fully accepted. And since there is a practical and concrete side to participation in a community, marginality is almost equivalent to being outside. However, the practical effects for the life of the community are not elaborated in these documents.

[157] Concerning the hostility towards women in various religions as a result of a male centered definition of the norms and laws, see, for instance, Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 1972, repr. 1979, p.111, "At the moment when man asserts himself as subject and free being, the idea of the Other is dramatic, the existence of the Other is a threat, a danger." Cf. also Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion*, 1991, p.122.

[158] Holiness and war are bound together in e.g. Deut 23,9-14 and 2 Sam 11,7-13, hence the demand to separate from women. See to this, Eduard Nielsen, *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.171.

[159] To see in 1QSa 1,9 a possibility of membership for families, including women, seems an over-interpretation. Against Laurence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 1983, p.57-58.

[160] The idea of women and men created in the image of God plays no role in the Dead Sea Scrolls, neither as origin nor as restoration of humankind. See Hermann Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 1980, p.169-70.
If 1QS 4,23 כבוד אדם is translated as "glory of Adam" (with G. Vermes, P.

To sum up. When covenant is defined in priestly terms, boundaries too are defined in priestly terms. Since entry to the covenant is almost equivalent to entry to the community, concrete ritual washings in their priestly origin and purpose become the symbols of purification and sanctification as well as marks of status within the community. Since purification aims at both consecration and restoration to a state of holiness, there is no interest in a once-for-all initiation rite. The repeated use of examinations of knowledge and deeds indicates that a change in status takes place gradually, and since a growth to full membership is important in 1QS, repeated rites are equally important. Entry and belonging are always in a context of dissociation from those outside the covenant community. The boundaries to be crossed are not between Jews and Gentiles, rather between affirming covenantal membership and refusing to do so. Moreover when boundaries are defined in narrow terms of rank, they apply even within the already particularistic and exclusive community.

III. Conclusion.

In 1QS the covenant is understood narrowly, referring to those who choose to enter the covenant relationship. Unlike CD the covenant of the past is no longer important, nor is national inclusiveness which in Jubilees was an issue. The different emphases on covenant. point to a change of covenant identity. This change implies a considerable change in self-understanding, seen when "entry to the covenant" becomes a matter of a free choice, of "devoting oneself" to a life in obedience to the law, of consecrating oneself to holiness. And thus a radical breach with the Old Testament and its covenant identity has taken place. The establishment of a community, such as seen in 1QS, which exists to embody the true relationship with God, is a clear example of a movement away from a "civil religious society" to a "particular religious society".

In 1QS a community is defined with clear boundaries. By excluding all born Jews who have not made a conscious choice to enter the covenant, ethnic identity and boundaries have been abandoned and instead boundaries are based on a priestly identity. and defined by priestly purity, expressed explicitly

---

Wernberg-Møller, A.R.C. Leaney and Benedikt Otzen) the implication is that the restoration of the pious is thought to be a return to the situation before the fall. Cf CD 3,20, quoted above p.124.
See Benedikt Otzen, *StTh* 11, 1957, p.96-98; *Dødehavsteksterne*, 1959, p.65; Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual*, 1957, p.87.
Nothing, however, in this indicates a hope for a restoration of humanity, along the lines of an eschatological time with "neither male nor female", which is one of the possible implications of Gal 3,28.

through the system of ranking members within the community. By implication this opens up the possibility of creating new rites, if not of initiation, at least of affirmation of belonging.

There is no clear indication of a rite of initiation. Instead the boundary crossings are within Israel and within the community. marking change in status internally and a change with respect to commitment.

Together with as identity and boundaries change, understanding of the relationship with God changes. The change is from (a) the Old Testament view of the relationship with God manifest in the history of the people as well as in cult and worship, found also in Jubilees, to (b) CD's view that the entrance to the (new) covenant is the beginning of a future restoration of the relationship with God. Finally the change is to (c) 1QS, defining a pure community to which the presence of God's holiness is confined in preparation for the judgment. This community is identified by its hope of receiving "everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light" (1QS 4,7-8).

The particularity of the theology and practice of 1QS is most noticeable when covenant identity is narrowed down, and boundaries for election and rules for entry made rigorous. So, when the covenant relationship with God is established, not by God but by humans who wish to fulfil the covenant obligations, and purity maintained, this is reflected in visible and narrow boundaries. These narrow symbols are markers of human acceptance of God's covenant, of entry to a community with its own ritual and moral practices, of consecration to holiness. Thereby boundaries function as divisions within the community, while they preserve a place for the presence of God in the world until the eschaton.

CHAPTER FIVE.

AN INVALID COVENANT IDENTITY - A SYMBOLIC BOUNDARY.

So far I have traced the pattern of interdependence between identity and boundaries, looking primarily at the way a community expresses its identity in covenantal terms and marks its boundaries through rituals. By showing that ritual boundaries and covenant identity are interdependent I concluded that a broadly based identity is reflected in widely defined ethnic boundaries, and a narrow self-understanding in narrower ritual boundaries. The change that takes place is from belonging as defined by birth and affirmed by circumcision, to belonging maintained by purification. In this chapter I shall explore whether or not this insight illuminates the material about John the Baptist. John left no written remains which would enable a detailed study along the lines followed so far in this thesis.[1] His association with baptism in the Christian tradition, however, makes some treatment at this point desirable. The material on John the Baptist is found in Josephus[2] and the New Testament.[3]

Josephus' treatment of John the Baptist seems biased, but he makes it clear that repentance brings inner purification while baptism is for "purification of the body".[4] Apparently he intends to be apologetic by depicting John as a harmless preacher of virtue, not as a prophet who challenges religious, political or social boundaries. Although sympathetic to John, he bases his account on his own notion of prophecy.[5] As for the New Testament writers they are equally biased inasmuch as we find a Christian interpretation of

---

[1] Unless one accepts the hypothesis of J. Massyngbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, AncB 38, 1975, p.3.28-37, that parts of Revelation originate with John the Baptist, or a group around him, there are no writings that have John the Baptist as author.

[2] Jos. Ant. XVIII, 114-19, (Loeb edition). The Slavonic text of Josephus: The Jewish War 2,7,2 and 2,9,1 is most likely a Christian interpolation. See Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.32-36, with translation given.

[3] Mark: 1,1-15 and par.; 2,18-20 and par.; 6,14-29 and par.; 9,11-13 and par.
Matt: 3,7-10 par. to Luke 3,7-9; Matt 3,12 par. to Luke 3,17; Matt 11,2-19 par. to Luke 7,18-35 (often referred to as Q material).
Luke's special material: 1,5-25.39-80; 3,10-14.15.18; 11,1; 16,16.
John: 1,1-37; 3,22-36; 4,1-3; 5,32-36; 10,40-41.
Acts: 1,5.22; 10,37; 11,16; 13,24-25; 18,24-19,7.
There are a number of references to John in the extra-canonical writings, but these are later and tendentious, and provide no information.

[4] This expression, to which I shall return, is from Jos Ant. XVIII, 117. Feldman translates: "consecration of the body".

[5] Cf. Horst R. Moehring, *ANRW* 2.21.2, 1984, p.864-944,; David Hill, in *Text and Interpretation*, 1979, p.143-54.

John the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus. His significance is inextricably linked to the Christian kerygma, christology and salvation history. Thus, for the evangelists John belongs either to an era that is about to end, or to the beginning of the period of the gospel. Consequently there is little or no interest in John's self-understanding; he is isolated from his Jewish context. It is questionable, therefore, whether this material will provide an adequate sample for a discussion of the pattern so far discussed. Nevertheless, the historical significance of John the Baptist cannot be denied.[6] John's activity is part of a movement of renewal, parallel in some degree to those represented by Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls, and his preaching of repentance addressed to all Israel inevitably poses a question of identity. His baptism, whatever its precise relation to subsequent Christian baptism, evidently served as a paradigm, as numerous scholars have demonstrated, and so poses the question whether this baptism marks a political boundary, a social boundary, a religious boundary of belonging to a community, or is a symbolic boundary of belonging to God.

I. Does "Children to Abraham" Presuppose a Covenant Identity?

I shall briefly discuss what kind of identity John presupposes, assuming the expression, "children to Abraham" goes back to him.[7] The saying runs thus, according to Matthew 3,9:

> "Do not presume to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our ancestor'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham."

The phrase "children to Abraham" occurs only in Matthew (3,9) and Luke (3,8), and in both cases the narrow context is John's call for repentance

---

[6] For a historical approach I refer especially to the monographs of Charles H.H. Scobie; Jürgen Becker. The best overview is found in Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, who gives a nuanced interpretation of John in the different sources, p.4-263
For a theological (redactional) analysis, see the study by Walter Wink; and for a recent socio-historical approach see the works by Paul Hollenbach and Robert L. Webb. See My Bibliography, part IV, for details.

[7] The majority of scholars take Matt 3,7-10/ Luke 3,7-9 as a genuine saying that goes back to John the Baptist. See e.g. Eta Linnemann, *Festschrift*, 1973, p.219-36, who simultaneously argues that this passage reflects the conflict between John and Jesus over different views of repentance and of the manifestation of the reign of God.
A different view is expressed by Rudolf Bultmann, in his classic study, *History*, 1972, p.117, in which he holds the opinion that this passage is Christian tradition, ascribed to John the Baptist.
More recently the authenticity has been questioned by Carl R. Kazmierski, *Bib* 68, 1987, p.22-39. He believes the saying reflects a context of an honour-shame society and is an attempt at restoring honour to an important figure who has been negatively labelled (cf. Matt 11,18/ Luke 5,33), thus he views the Christian-Baptist controversy as too narrow a context.

and his demand for the fruit(s) of repentance.[8] The passage concludes with the image of the axe lying at the root of the tree as a metaphor for destruction.[9] As a proclamation this is in line with the Old Testament prophetic critique of Israel, including predictions of its destruction.[10] We find similar ideas on judgment in the Dead Sea Scrolls with their expectation of an all embracing destruction.[11] The expression is problematic because it lacks direct parallels.[12]

The key questions are: Does this expression show that John accepts a covenant identity? that he replaces national, ethnic belonging with a different identity, or does he redefine ethnic belonging? Alternatively expressed, Does John assume covenantal identity, simply by referring to Abraham, or does he disregard it?

It is of note that John, in Matthew, addresses Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism (3,7); in Luke, the crowds. Both are probably redactions.[13] It is possible, with Paul Hollenbach,to take his message as addressed to the priestly aristocracy, whom he describes as "unrepentant

---

[8] For the meaning of fruit(s) of repentance, see Walter Grundmann, *Lukas*, 1981, p.104: "Die Frucht der Umkehr besteht in gütingem und gerechtem Handeln in der Konkreten Situation des jeweiligen Lebens und Berufes."
A different view is found in Poul Nepper-Christensen, *Matthæusevangeliet*, 1988, p.48, who thinks fruit may refer to baptism.

[9] Both have a warning, that God's wrath cannot be escaped.

[10] Several parallels for a prophetic condemnation of Israel as a people can be found, see e.g. Trito-Isaiah 59,1-5 and several other passages in Isaiah such as 8,5-22. Further Ezek 5,1-17; Jer 13,1-11.

[11] Here only the righteous, those who have chosen to join the community, will be able to escape the destruction of evil. See 1QH 3,12-28; 1QS 11,7-9; 1QpHab 10,1-16; 13,1-4.

[12] The problem with the expression "children to Abraham" when interpreted in terms of identity is that this way of expressing identity is not found in Jubilees, nor in the Dead Sea Scrolls, therefore is not a parallel to what I dealt with above.
Jubilees uses the expression "children (sons) of Israel", e.g. 2,33; 6,19.20; 15,29.33, 34,18; 46,1; 49,8.22; 50,13, identifying the Israelites as Jacob's descendants, hence different than a claim to Abrahamic descent.
Note, that when 1QS uses "children" as in "children of righteousness", "children of light" it is opposed to "children of falseness", "children of darkness", not in a context of Abrahamic descent (cf. e.g. 3,13-4,26).
It is conspicuous that when Paul refers to Abraham, e.g. in Rom 4, Abraham is perceived as the ancestor of all who believe; and when Paul uses Abraham to address the issue of inheritance in Gal 4, his point is that all of faith may claim to be descendants of Abraham, hence heirs to the covenant promise. It is significant that his readers are identified as "children", not of Abraham, but of God. By referring to "children" in a wider sense than genealogical belonging, Paul replaces ethnic identity by faith relationship, whereas John the Baptist emphasises fruits of repentance, and thus clearly uses Abraham for a different purpose.

[13] Cf. Eta Linnemann, *Festschrift*, 1973, p.228.

powerful", since "they do not practise deeds to match their 'repentance'".[14] If this is correct, Matthew's version would be the original. However, Hollenbach's other point that this is "too specific" to be addressed to the whole people, is not convincing. If Luke's version is original, it suggests that he in fact addressed not only the powerful but large crowds.[15] Or if both are redactional, it is possible, as Eta Linnemann argues, that John's eschatological/apocalyptic message of baptism and repentance reached both the elite and the less privileged, but with different messages and different results.[16] Thus she argues that Matt 3,9/ Luke 3,8b is addressed to those who thought they needed no baptism being aware of their Abrahamic descent, while Matt 3,7b.8/ Luke 3,7b.8a is addressed to those who came to baptism showing no visible signs of repentance. Whether the identity of the audience is one or the other, it suffices to conclude that the reference to Abraham assumes an audience of Jewish origin.[17]

It is also clear that John refers to Abrahamic descent and rejects it as no longer adequate. What exactly does John accept and what does he reject? In relation to identity, when Jews refer to Abraham as their ancestor this is a positive statement; moreover, that identification is not rejected by John. But while he accepts it, he stresses that it can no longer serve as a claim for preference.[18] In relation to God, and God's judgment, other criteria are more important. What is important to John is rather Abraham as example for right behaviour.

When John gives priority to ethical behaviour over Abrahamic descent, this raises the question whether individual identity (and salvation) is more important than corporate belonging. Does John address Israel collectively or individuals inside Israel? Both are conceivable in a Jewish context. The key factor here is that John defines identity with a view to the future, not to

---

[14] *ANRW* 2,19,2, 1979, p.860-61, with reference to C.H. Kraeling.

[15] Thus, Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.83. Cf. commentaries to this passage, esp. Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium 1*, 1969, p.163.

[16] In, *Festschrift*, 1973, p.229-30.

[17] Abraham is important in both the Old Testament and the intertestamental literature, and has a special status before God, see for instance Jub 17,17-18 (Abraham loved God) 19,9 (friend of God); PsPh 6,17-18 (Abraham escapes fire).
For Abraham as epitome of perfection see Sir 44,20-21; Jub 6,19; 16,28; 18; 21,2; 23,10; 2 Bar 57,1-2; Test Levi 9,12; Prayer of Manassah 8; 1 Mac 2,52; 3 Mac 6,3; 4 Mac 16,20.

[18] See e.g. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.64, who interprets John's rejection of ethnic decent to lead up to the following image of the tree, which he then interprets as an image for Israel, not a metaphor for universal fruits. Accordingly, the judgment is a judgment of Israel.

the past: he does not describe belonging in genealogical or social terms but in ethical categories. In addition to this identity is defined in terms of a promise of escape from judgment, conditional on a change of life-style. This means he addresses both individuals and Israel as a people.[19] It is of note that when John calls for a return from sin, from evil, and return to God, not the law (of which there is no mention), he is concerned with both individuals and Israel's status which has consequences for boundary marks.[20] Ultimately a change in the foundation of identity - from being historically based on a collective covenant to being eschatologically based within individual and corporate identity - has taken place.[21]

By denying descent and status to Jews, it would appear that John, albeit indirectly, rejected the validity of both covenant and election. Although our sample of his preaching is small, there is no real evidence that John was concerned with covenant identity, let alone affirmed it.[22] Since I find no direct reference to covenant obedience in the context of fruits of repentance, as would have been most natural to a Jew,[23] nor any specific reference to a covenant promise, as when Paul refers back to Abraham,[24] I cannot trace an ecclesiological identity similar to what is found in 1QS or CD. The point at issue seems rather to be God's creative power, because for John it is decisive that God is able to raise children to Abraham from

---

[19] Stressed by Lars Hartman, *Auf den Namen*, 1992, p.17.

[20] To this I shall return below.

[21] Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Ibid., p.67.

[22] I thus disagree with the view held by Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.201-2, because I fail to see how he can interpret the rejection of Abrahamic descent as a reaffirmation of the covenant promise, or state: "So only the repentant remnant constitutes the true Israel which will be preserved and restored, receiving the eschatological, covenant promises." By introducing a distinction between true and false, he introduces a dichotomy that is not present in the text.
Moreover, the fact that Webb can refer for instance to Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.83-84, who clearly does not hold the same view as Webb, does not make a convincing case.
A modified view may be found in Dale C. Allison, *JSNT* 29, 1987, p.59-60. Thus in a response to E.P.Sanders' use of "covenantal nomism" he states, p.60: "Thus the Baptist is not overturning the fundamental idea of covenant but rather repudiating the popular understanding of what the Abrahamic covenant entailed. We might put it this way: John does away not with covenant but with popular 'covenantal nomism'." This view presupposes covenant as a soteriological category. The problem with this is that salvation is individualised, cf. p.60, which is probably anachronistic.

[23] Thus there is no reference to obedience to the law when fruits are called for, as was the case in e.g. in 1QS 3,6.
This point was made already by Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.70-71.

[24] See above, note 12.

stones.[25] Has he then with this suggested a different category for identity?

If John defined identity in terms of status before God, then Gentiles, in principle, could qualify as much as Jews for an escape from judgment, or indeed for participation in salvation. This is actually the way John's message is received in the early church, where salvation is for Gentiles.[26] In the Baptist's own message, however, there is no mention of Gentiles;[27] so it seems doubtful whether the Baptist looked beyond Israel or intended to question the traditional boundary between Israel and Gentiles.

Following from this, the question is: Is "children to Abraham", an ecclesiological definition, or an eschatological term? If this expression is seen in the context of God as creator of humanity, there may be an allusion to a new beginning initiated by God, much in line with the Old Testament prophets' hope for renewal.[28] By drawing on Isaiah 51,1-2[29] John expresses a hope of God creating a new humanity.[30] Although it is in line with traditional theology to take "children to Abraham" in a context of eschatological renewal, John makes no attempt to widen the perspective to a new creation, to draw on Adam and a new humanity.[31] Nor does he attempt to limit "children" as an ecclesiological category. Instead the context suggests ethical identity with an eschatological horizon. The underlying issue is God's creative power, presented as a potentiality, not a reality. From the fact that John shows no interest in what determines covenant from past or from present, I conclude that covenant is not a valid identity term; moreover, "children to Abraham" is better understood as an ethical than as an ecclesiological category.

---

[25] Often noted as a play on words, אבנים-בנים, see for instance Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.302. In reference to Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium I*, 1969, p.165, who interprets this as a matter concerning God's freedom.
See also François Bovon, *Lukas*, 1989, p.172, with references to the Old Testament background.

[26] A redaction which has a christian catechetical aim is likely, according to Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas*, 1977, p.85.

[27] When Luke 3,10-14 mentions soldiers and tax collectors in the audience, it is difficult to determine whether they were Jewish or not. If they were Gentiles, this is not made an issue for Luke, see Hollenbach, p.872-73. Cf. Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.83.
The question of Gentiles seems for Luke-Acts to lie outside the scope of John's preaching which the traditions preserved in the kerygmatic material in Acts testify to (10,36-37 and 13,24).

[28] Cf. Chapter One, (II) (4).

[29] Noted already by Alfred Plummer, *S.Luke*, 1922, p.90.

[30] Cf. Isaiah 42,1-9 in which renewal is expressed in terms of the hope that Israel will be a light to the nations.

[31] Thus noted already by Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.63.

In sum, while John accepts the Abrahamic origin of Israel, he rejects the notion that Abrahamic descent determines any status before God and rejects covenant as basis for future identity. Ethnic identity is questioned inasmuch as descent is of no significance for escaping the divine wrath. Rather identity and ethical behaviour are closely correlated. Moreover, because identity has an eschatological, not a historical, dimension, covenant with its foundation in the past is not an adequate term for a present ecclesiological identity. Although covenant could serve as a soteriological category, it seems to be dismissed with a reference to God's creative power with freedom being more significant than God's covenantal revelation.

After this let me clarify further the question of identity by asking, Did John intend to create a different ecclesiological corporate structure?

II. A Baptist Community?

There are no writings that can be traced to a Baptist community, and with no text to reflect group identity as with Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls I cannot embark on a detailed discussion of this. Besides it is difficult within the limits of this study to assess historically how far there was a community of disciples around John.[32] The key questions related to group identity and boundaries are: What evidence is there for a structured community around John the Baptist? If John was surrounded by a group of disciples does this mean that he also created a group separated from mainstream Israel? Or did he rather see himself as a prophet operating within Israel's boundaries? Some would maintain that John was influenced by the Dead Sea Scroll community and that he created a community similar to that which these writings reflect.[33] What evidence is there for this?

All the gospels mention that John had disciples, as Jesus had.[34] However,

---

[32] For a detailed study see Knut Backhaus, *Die "Jüngerkreise"*, 1991.

[33] This hypothesis has a number of followers, see e.g. W.H. Brownlee, in *The Scrolls*, 1958, p.35-36; O. Cullmann, in *The Scrolls*, 1958, p.24-25; Otto Betz, *RdQ* 1, 1958-59, p.222; Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.38-40.
Note that Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.277.325-330, points to the common background in Judaism and offers an extensive critique of the alleged influence from a Dead Sea Scroll community on John, while Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.209-16, offers a less reserved critique

[34] Thus, Matt 9,14; 11,2; 14,12; Mark 2,18; Luke 5,33-34; 7,18-30; 11,1; cf. Acts 19,3-4.
The mention of disciples in Acts 19 gives evidence for a group existing after the death of John. Whether or not they had formed themselves as a group in his lifetime is not indicated.

they do not indicate whether this is a group separated from the rest of society or a movement within it. It seems that if the evangelists knew of a community or a movement, they made sure not to reveal that such a movement was also a valid community. If judgment is the original core of John's message, this would explain that he had little or no interest in creating a community within or apart from Israel.[35] The report that disciples of John turned away from him to follow Jesus (John 1,35-41), may testify to the fact that John's ministry was understood by himself as preliminary. It may equally reflect some sort of rivalry between different movements. Even if all the gospels agree that John had followers, there is no clear evidence that these disciples constituted themselves as a group or a socially defined community.[36] For the gospels the Christ event is the decisive theological event that makes the Christian community valid.

While the Dead Sea Scrolls testify to the creation of one or more ecclesiological communities with a strong eschatological awareness, characterised by submission to a rigid, exclusive system of ritual and moral rules, there is no evidence that these communities influenced John.[37] Most significant, there is no evidence that John was particularly influenced by eschatological dualism as in 1QS, or that he drew similar consequences of exclusive election found in these writings.[38] There is, however, evidence of parallel interests, for instance in the call for conversion/repentance.[39] John's anticipation of an imminent judgment is the key motif to his activity, which

---

[35] Cf. Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.338.

[36] See Josef Ernst, *Vom Urchristentum*, 1989, p.31:" Der Jüngerkreis, der sich um Johannes sammelte, hatte keine festen Organisationsformen, die tragenden Stützen eines deratigen Instituts: die Lehre, das Ausbildungsziel, die Lebensgemeinschaft such man in Imkreis des Johannes vergeblich. Nicht Sozialisation, sondern Individualisation ist das Kennzeichen. Die täuferischen Lebensformen tendieren nicht auf Gruppenbildung, sondern auf Sammlung zur Gemeinde der Endzeit."

[37] Whether John was at one point associated with, or maybe broke away from, a Dead Sea Scroll community, can only be a matter of speculation, as noted by Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.213. Further references found here.

[38] For a discussion see Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.325-330, who points to differences that cannot be overlooked. The most significant difference concerns eschatology. Further, John's baptism presupposes no elitist group, no communal life or submission to priestly purity as is the case in 1QS. See above in Chapter Four.

[39] This is in line with the apocalyptic writings. The difference is, however, that John accentuates the urgency for a "conversion" as a way to escape the imminent divine wrath and obtain forgiveness, while for most apocalyptic writings salvation is in the future, after the destruction of the present order, seen as a restoration of (faithful) Israel, or a replacement by a new reality. A close parallel can be seen in the Testament of Abraham, where judgment is universal, and escape is through repentance, e.g. 12,1-13,8; 14,15.

means his call is eschatologically conditioned, and ethically, but not ecclesiologically, applied. Moreover, if his activity is primarily within the context of Israel, there is no occasion to build a new structure; if judgment orientated, there is no time to create a different structure. John's message is a protest, indicating partial acceptance of inherited ethnic identity, but not (yet) creating an identity within or apart from Israel; partly a protest against a belief that belonging to Abraham's family is sufficient.[40]

It is often asserted that John is part of a "Jewish, sectarian baptist movement", as in the study of Charles H.H. Scobie.[41] Moreover Robert L. Webb seems to assume the existence of a group or community that thought of itself as the true Israel exists, rather than arguing how it came into being.[42] I find this questionable, particularly when "movement" is equated with "community", or "group". There is no clear evidence for a community in the texts, as I shall now demonstrate.

Josephus shows no knowledge of disciples following John, nor does he seem to be aware that John was structuring a movement around him. He uses two terms for John's audience, "the Jews", *οἱ Ἰουδάιοι*, whom he called to "join in baptism", *βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι* (Ant XVIII 117);[43] and, "the others", *οἱ ἄλλοι* (Ant XVIII 118). It is not clear who "the Jews" are; nor whether it is an ethnic or a religious term . From the context it looks as if he refers to those Jews whom he called to be baptised, conditional on a virtuous life, and promised a purification of their souls.[44] There seems to be a contrast to

---

[40] As argued above in I.

[41] See *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.33-40, esp. p.37. Scobie is not consistent, because elsewhere, p.131, he also states "John the Baptist had no intention of founding a new sect, far less of starting a new religion", and thus he contradicts himself.

[42] See *John*, 1991, e.g. p.215, where he concludes that John's baptism functions as initiation into a "corporate body", which he also designates as the "eschatological community". However, to operate with an eschatological community as if this were an ecclesiological reality is neither precise, nor helpful.

[43] It is doubtful whether the expression, *βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι*, carries a political meaning such a "uniting", as Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.31, in reference to M. Goguel, opts for. Against this Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.131-2, suggests that those baptised were "not initiated into a sect" but ordinary people who after baptism "returned to their daily tasks".
More to the point is Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.255, following Wilhelm Brandt, who suggests a religious, social meaning, thus a functional use.

[44] I follow the interpretation of John P. Meier, *JBL* 111, 1992, p.231, that the practise of virtue is a necessary precondition for obeying John's principal command, to be baptised. Thus, "John addresses his offer of

those called οἱ ἄλλοι. If one group, "the Jews", is singled out for baptism due to their lifestyle, then the other group,"the others", may refer to some who do not immediately qualify for a virtuous life, that is, Jews to whom baptism cannot be administered because purification cannot be promised unconditionally.[45] Josephus' two groups can perhaps be explained as a sort of elite alongside to the rest of the population. Since there are no signs that John contrasts Gentiles with Jews, it is an unlikely that the two groups refer to them.[46] Rather, Josephus describes John as one who aimed at changing ethical, but not ethnic identity, and concerned with the moral, but not the political-ethnic boundaries of the Jews. So, although Josephus sees John as a "good man" who challenged moral boundaries, he clearly indicates that he became a threat to political boundaries, which explains why he was executed.

According to Mark "people from the whole Judean countryside", πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα, and "all the people of Jerusalem", οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῖται πάντες, came to John and were baptised, confessing their sins (1,5). This description is clearly the evangelist's exaggeration. Both in respect of tone and of content this reads as eschatological interpretation rather than historical reality.[47] By adding forgiveness to baptism Mark indicates that John the Baptist mediates an eschatological sign, or offers a gift to "all" who confess their sins;[48] those coming for baptism who show that they are obedient to God and accept baptism as a sign of repentance are depicted as expecting eschatological salvation;[49] thus Mark takes the standpoint that to undergo baptism is to participate in an event that has consequences for salvation. For him therefore, the baptism of Jesus functions as an experience assigning Jesus to sonship and election.[50] However, it is not

---

baptism to Jews on condition that they are already practicing virtue." For a similar view, "practising virtue and acting with justice".... "must accompany the baptism", see Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.188, and the discussion here.

[45] Cf. Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.352 and John P. Meier, Ibid., p.232. Meier links this to Herod's fear of crowds, thus explaining Herod's attempt to stop what could lead to revolt and be dangerous.

[46] This reflects the readership rather than the actual historical reality.

[47] For this point see Ernst Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 1967, p.15, pointing to Isa 48,20 and 52,11 as scriptural foundation.

[48] The episode in Mark 2,18-22 gives a background to the praxis of Jesus and his disciples with respect to fasting. What the actual meaning of John's fasting was is not specified, but if fasting is seen in a context of μετανοία, it may not be a characteristic of one group over against another, but of a movement, thus the term "eschatological demonstration" applies. See Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium I*, 1977, p.172, for further references and discussion.

[49] Cf. Lars Hartman, in *Jesus in der Verkündigung*, 1976, p.97.

[50] For Lars Hartman, Ibid., p.103-107 this also means that when Jesus

clear whether baptism administered to the crowds is an event that separates some Jews from mainstream Judaism and is therefore limited to those, or it is a symbol exclusively for Jews so that Gentiles are not included. In short, for Mark baptism is an eschatological symbol of forgiveness rather than a mark of ecclesiological belonging.

Like Mark, Matthew knows of crowds coming to be baptised by John (cf. Matt 3,5-6), confessing their sins. Unlike Luke, Matthew specifically addresses the Jewish establishment. Thus he contrasts the people with its leaders (3,7), and hence operates with those who believe and those who reject John. The confrontations (e.g. 9,27-34; 12,23-24; 16,1-4 and 21,23-46) show that Matthew refers to an opposition within Israel. Whether this reflects the marginal situation of his own community is unclear. Matthew's point that John is rejected by the establishment may not be historically correct.[51] If groups separated themselves in any way, and if the activity of John gave rise to a community of followers, Matthew has an interest in ignoring this. Perhaps he speaks against the Jewish opposition of his own time in order to give priority to the idea that Israel is fulfilled in the church as the true community.[52]

Luke's special material includes a passage saying that among the crowds who came to seek John there were soldiers (3,14) and tax-collectors (3,12). This could indicate that John, like Jesus, breaks social boundaries. On the other hand, one cannot be sure that John is breaking away from Israel's ethnic identity, since it is not specifically said that these groups are of Gentile origin.[53] By including them Luke may have wanted simply to emphasise individual response, or to stress social justice by calling on moral behaviour. It is of note that John demands ethical responses also of

---

receives the gift of sonship along with the Spirit, he is the representative of the covenant people. He further postulates that this Markan interpretation of the baptism of Jesus is known to Paul, cf. Gal 4,6 and Rom 8,14. Although it is possible that Paul knew such an interpretation, it cannot be maintained that it goes back further than to the post-easter interpretation. John's baptism is evidently read in the light of the Christ event.

[51] See for instance Albert Fuchs, *Jesus in der Verkündigung* 1976, p.62-75, esp. p.72-73. He suggests the separation between church and synagogue at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem as a "Sitz-im-Leben" for Matthew. For further references see Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.41.

[52] Cf. Ulrich Luz, *Matthäus*, 1985, p.147.

[53] Soldiers could be Jewish soldiers from Herod's army, cf. Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas*, 1977, p.86; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, p.470. Or they could be Roman soldiers, cf. François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 1989, p.174. However, it is not specifically said that tax-collectors and soldiers were Jews or Gentiles.

marginal groups.[54] It may, however, reflect no more than that Luke's readers were a mixture of social classes and/or of Jews and Gentiles.[55] Basically he relegates John to the old era, and there is no evidence that shared ethics gave rise to the constitution of a community existing apart from Israel.

The fourth gospel is more problematical. First it depicts "Jews" confronting the Baptist by telling about "priests and Levites from Jerusalem" (1,19), and Pharisees (1,24) who ask John theological questions on authority. This portrays a rejection by the establishment that appears as historical reality; but it may equally well reflect the situation of the Johannine community.[56] Secondly, the fourth gospel depicts John as surrounded by a group of disciples who from the beginning were also rivals to that of Jesus.[57] Whether John actually organized an eschatological movement that could be characterized as an established community is not clear from the evidence. At best the fourth gospel is ambiguous. The indication that John was surrounded by disciples may be historically correct;[58] or it may reflect the situation of the the evangelist, that there were some who after the death of the Baptist had established themselves as a group opposed to followers of Jesus. It is possible that the two to some degree were parallel, both being messianic movements; but different, inasmuch as each had its view of who the Messiah was. If Johannine christology is taken into consideration, it is clear that Jesus is designated both as "the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" and as Messiah who was sent to Israel. John was witness to both (cf 1,29 and 31). This may be stressed because some claimed John the baptist as Messiah to Israel, which the evangelist rejects. Since there is a general tendency to stress that Jesus is superior to John, and a particular interest in the witness role of John, this may reflect a first century antagonism as it developed rather than actual facts. It means the importance of the Baptist is not denied; he is however subordinated to Jesus. So I infer that if the writer of the fourth gospel knew of a

---

[54] Cf. Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium 1*, 1969, p.168; Paul Hollenbach, *ANRW* 2,19,2 1979, p.869-75.

[55] Cf. Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.313.

[56] Cf. C.K. Barrett, *St John*, 1962, p.143.

[57] Cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I*, 1966, p.167-169. For an alternative view, see David Rensberger, *Overcoming the World*, 1988, p.55-57.

[58] Thus C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 1963, p.320, concludes that John had disciples but they were absorbed in the early church.
For a similar conclusion based on synoptic material see e.g. T.W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah*, 1956, p.47, who interprets the information about teaching how to pray, cf. Luke 11,1, and fasting cf. Mark 2,18 as historical evidence.

community, he made it insignificant; if there was a group contemporary to the gospel being written, its importance was diminished, although its origin not denied.

From this I conclude, that there is no clear evidence of any social or religious group formed around John, or emerging from his activity in his life-time. It seems as if the gospel redactors deliberately use their sources in an ambiguous way, either because historically no more than a movement with eschatological expectations existed, or what group there was had been dissolved, or merged with the early church. Although it is conceivable that a group existed, it is also likely that it was formed after John's death. From an overall point of view, it would also have been in the interests of the evangelists not to mention any group with a similar, competitive message of eschatological judgment and/or salvation to their own.

III. John's Baptism: A Symbolic Boundary?

Despite the conclusions of section II, discussion of section I posed the question of boundaries. Did John the Baptist understand or practise his baptism as a boundary mark? I shall confine my discussion to two aspects of John's baptism: (1) Baptism as initiation rite marking a change of social identity; (2) Baptism as purity symbol marking forgiveness, and serving also to restore and affirm a state of belonging and to maintain, but not change a social and religious status. By focusing on these two aspects that concern identity and boundaries in a particular way I should have sufficient ground for answering the question, Does John's baptism function as a boundary marker?

(1) Initiation. To label John's baptism as an initiation rite is possible only if two related questions are answered positively, namely: Does the rite take place "once only"? Does it somehow mark an entry into a community? Phrased differently, Do those undergoing the ritual cross a symbolic boundary? Do individuals enter into a new community and thus separate themselves from what they previously belonged to? Do they change their identity, their status, by means of a baptismal ritual?

A rite of entry that marks a transition is inherently unrepeatable. While there is no textual evidence one way or the other it is generally accepted that John's baptism was administered once only.[59] In this it differs from

---

[59] This is almost universally held, and as an illustration, let me refer to Otto Böcher, *TRE* 17, 1988, p.172-3, who typically takes John's baptism as a development of the Jewish proselyte baptism, and sees it as "Initiations-

Jewish ritual washings, including those mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but is similar to Christian baptism. Since the gospel accounts of John's baptism have been and are read with Christian eyes, and not against their Jewish background, his baptism is consequently interpreted in the light of the later development of theology of entry and reflects the initiatory practice of the early church. Since Josephus is perhaps deliberately polemicising against a Christian view, or is critical of another tradition,[60] his description could be an attempt to play down the initiatory aspect. The only conclusion one can draw is that we cannot know whether John's baptism was in fact practised only once, or was repeated like other purity rites.

All four gospels refer to John's activity, his preaching and baptising, as a way to introduce the ministry of Jesus. When the gospel writers make John the precursor to the Messiah, they simultaneously see Jesus' own baptism as a rite in preparation for his ministry, like an ordination, which takes place once only. By referring to this past event as the occasion on which Jesus made an entry to his mission, the synoptics justify Christian baptism in their own second generation Christianity, rather than give evidence for the nature of John's baptism.[61] However, since this reads a christology back into John's baptism, it does not prove that John's baptism was an initiatory rite.

As I have already argued, it seems doubtful that there existed a community around John, or that he thought of his group as a distinct institution outside the existing social structures. If no community exists, there are no community boundaries to cross, and no rite of initiation.[62] Only when boundaries are distinctly drawn to reflect a clearly defined identity is it possible to establish whether a crossing takes place, either in terms of transitional entry or change of status. It is conceivable that an institutionalisation took place after John's death, and that baptism then became a

---

ritus für die Zugehörigkeit zum wahren, von Sündenschuld gereignigten Israel der Endzeit". A similar view is given by Lars Hartman, *AnBD* I, 1992, p.583-4.
For the opposite, exceptional view, see Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone*, 1970, p.138.

[60] Cf. Hermann Lichtenberger, *ZThK* 84, 1987, p.45.

[61] For Mark the emphasis is on Jesus being chosen as Son, cf. 1,1-11; for Matthew it is on fulfilment, cf. 3,1-17; for Luke, the presence of the Spirit at the baptism, cf. 3,2-22 whereas for John there is no explicit mention of Jesus actually being baptised, cf. 1,19-34.

[62] For this view see Friedrich Lang, *Jesus Christus*, 1975, p.462.
I challenge the view that baptism is an initiation rite by means of which entry into a renewed Israel takes place, as expressed by Otto Böcher, *TRE* 17, 1988, p.172, quoted above in note 59. A renewed Israel is not an institution, thus one cannot define eschatological entry in ecclesiological terms. This blurs the discussion and mixes categories in an unhelpful way.

rite of initiation.[63] If John aimed at establishing an identity associated with ethical behaviour, but not different from the existing national identity, he did not regard his baptism as a rite of initiation. If John had in mind a future identity and simultaneously expected a radical eschatological change for Israel, it is conceivable that he thought of his baptism as a symbol, designating a preparation for eschatological salvation and/or destruction,[64] or a prefiguration of eschatological cleansing with the spirit.[65]

(2) Purification. When sin distorts the relationship with God, atonement is needed, with forgiveness as the result. In contemporary Judaism it was a priestly function, a cultic performance, to bring atonement for sins and to ensure that the right relationship between God and the people was affirmed and maintained. And when people were in a state of uncleanness or impurity, purification rites needed to be performed. They functioned to restore the impure to a pure status. Since purification rites and ritual washings vary both in type and quality, it can be difficult to generalise. Some rites are performed in response to defilement. Purification of priests serves to prepare for the encounter with the holiness of God, or as washing after the service in the holy place. They all confer change of status; common also is the function to distinguish between holy and unholy, pure and impure; thus they both separate and maintain distinct categories of identity. Two questions are important: Does John's baptism function as a boundary rite? When he offers forgiveness does this serve to maintain identity?

I shall briefly consider the implication for identity and boundaries of the phrase: *κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. This is found in Mark 1,4 and Luke 3,3.[66] The context in these gospels is salvation as restoration of the relationship to God in the eschaton.[67] This raises the

---

[63] See for this, Hartwig Thyen, *Zeit*, 1964, p.105.

[64] As seen by James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.17.

[65] This eschatological aspect of cleansing falls outside the scope of this study, but see for instance Nils Alstrup Dahl *NTT* 56, 1955 p.45, who states: "In the saying of John, Spirit should therefore, like fire, be understood as the higher, essential element of purification, the baptism with Spirit and fire being the *entrance-rite for those who are to appear before God in the assembly of the redeemed* (cf. also DSD 4,20 f.). This baptism will be performed by the mightier one, the water-baptism of John being only a humble, earthly prefiguration of it." (Italics mine.)

[66] Matthew has only: *κηρύσσων...μετανοεῖτε* (3,1-2) cf. *βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν* (3,11). The forgiveness of sins is in Matthew related to the last supper, cf. 26,28.

[67] See Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium I*, 1969, p.158-59; Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium I*, 1977, p.82; further Hartwig Thyen, *Studien*, 1970, p.132-33: "Durch das Hendiadyoin 'Busse und Vergebung' ist dabei nichts

question whether the forgiveness John offers in his focus on eschatological salvation and judgment actually is an issue of ecclesiological identity and boundaries. The first point is that of the appeal to people to accept baptism. Indirectly this questions the present cult and the forgiveness offered in it, although there is no direct attack on the cult and temple worship. Ultimately it presupposes a different idea of holiness.

This can be illustrated from an episode in the fourth gospel in which the establishment in Jerusalem was on guard. They sent 'priests and Levites' (1,19) 'from the Pharisees' (1,24).[68] Not only did they question the authority of John (1,19), they also asked why John baptised.[69] If this reflects the historical situation, it is a situation in which the establishment felt John's rite was a challenge to their symbols of forgiveness, to the purification offered within the traditional sacrificial cult.[70] Thus, from these remarks it can perhaps be gleaned that John's baptism as a rite that offered forgiveness did indeed challenge the cultic boundaries. If this is correct, the point is that John by offering an alternative to that of the established cult, offered an alternative relationship with God, so that his baptism functioned to reestablish the relationship with God. This took place, however, not through entry, but rather by forgiveness. Baptism affirmed a restored relationship with God by offering forgiveness of sins.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Ernst Lohmeyer, there was already in the description of the way John dressed and what he ate a protest against what was traditionally considered as pure/clean/holy.[71] If Lohmeyer is right, this

---

Geringeres als das endzeitliche Heil beschrieben."

[68] The Pharisees represent the authority of the people and the religious establishment, cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium I*, 1965, p.280-81. See also Birger Olson, *Structure*, 1974, p.126.

[69] As it stands, the meaning of John's baptism is not elaborated because the main interest is to subordinate and relate John to Jesus, and John's baptism of water (1,26.33) to baptism of the spirit (1,33; 3,5). Thus John's baptism loses its symbolic character, cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, Ibid., p.281. See also Raymond E.Brown, *The Gospel According to John I*, 1966, p.43.46.

[70] Cf. Joachim Gnilka, *RdQ* 3, 1961-62, p.185-207, takes John 1,19-28 as evidence for John's opposition to the Temple and priesthood, parallel to the opposition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, esp. p.200.
Nils Alstrup Dahl, *NTT* 56, 1955, p.36-52, notes that John, like the 'Qumran' community's leaders, belongs to a priestly family, and in both cases "a rupture with the temple and its sacrifices must have taken place, even if the closer circumstances are unknown to us", p.44.

[71] Most commentators point to the connection between asceticism and dress. For a representative view see Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, 1977, p.81.
Philipp Vielhauer holds the view that John's dress reflects the fact that John lives like a bedouin, and simultaneously he refutes the idea that the dress means that John represents Elijah, cf. *Aufsätze I*, 1965, p.47-54.

was an attack on priestly laws and practices in general, cultic purity and holiness in particular. So, if Luke has preserved historically reliable information about John's priestly family,[72] and also about his tendency to dissociate himself from his priestly descent, John broke away from the temple; hence he questioned the cult when he disregarded the traditional priestly signs of holiness.[73] If the call to baptism and the offer of forgiveness are seen in this light, then baptism functions to set alternative boundaries between God and the people. In that case John's baptism broke down rather than maintained the traditional identity structures, so that the protest against past and present cult was an attempt at a redefinition of holiness.

The second point to note is once again that both past and present identities are disregarded here. Baptism functions as a symbol of future, eschatological salvation, not as a symbol affirming social existence. This further implies that John's baptism was a symbol of hope, that is, hope of participation in the future eschatological salvation and of receiving the future gift of the Spirit.[74] Ultimately John'd baptism is tied to salvation. This, however, is not relevant in regard of ecclesiological boundaries.

In Josephus it is different. Here John is made a moralist: he calls the people to repentance, and offers a baptism of purification of the body. Since Josephus does not interpret John's baptism as being different from traditional rites of purification, the question is, What does he mean when he says that baptism is a purification of the body? The passage in question is unfortunately far from clear. If Josephus did not think John belonged within "normative" Judaism, why did he refer to John's baptism as a

---

It seems that Lohmeyer is the only one who sees a link to cleanness. Thus he draws attention to the fact that the camel is an unclean animal (Lev 11,4). If John dressed in the skin of a camel, which is just as likely as having made a dress of camel's hair, this is a clear protest against the rules for clean-unclean, see *Das Urchristentum*, 1932, p.124-29.

[72] Luke 1,5. For a discussion of the infancy narrative see, Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist*, 1964, p.50-59; Walter Wink, *John the Baptist*, 1968, p.58-82; Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1989, p.268-72; Robert L. Webb, *John*, 1991, p.60-63.

[73] The traditional priestly dress is a strong symbol of status, that is a symbol of holiness, as well as of authority. For the symbolic function of priestly garments in the Pentateuch, see Philip Peter Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 1992, p.124-128.

[74] Cf. Otto Böcher, *Rechtfertigung*, 1978, p.51. He points to the related form in the rites of cultic purity, and the related qualification in the prophetic hope for eschatological renewal, against the background of Isa 44,3; Ezek 36,25-27; 47,1-12; Zech 13,1-2; Joel 3,1 etc. He takes the eschatological cleansing as both ethical and cultic, since it signifies hope for the gift of the spirit of God.

purification? If he had wanted to show that John was engaged in breaking down traditional ritual boundaries, why is this not said explicitly? If he had wanted to give evidence that John was in fact building a new community, why did he not explain John's baptism in terms of him challenging the traditional boundaries? The brevity points to an attempt at defending John as being within the acceptable boundaries of Judaism.

In short, since there is no interest in depicting John as building ecclesiological structures, his baptism can hardly be designated an initiation rite. As John's aim rather was to restore the relationship between Israel and its God for the eschatological age, his baptism was an eschatological rite. It was a preparatory, purificatory and prophetic act, because it promised future salvation for Israel. If one focuses on John's protest against present structures, then present boundaries are challenged, so that John's baptism may be interpreted as a different purity rite, parallel to the rites of purification in normative Judaism. If one focuses on John offering forgiveness, then he may offer a new definition of holiness, less narrow than in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

IV. Conclusion.

The character of the sources makes it difficult to draw any clear conclusions on covenantal identity and boundaries in John the Baptist's material. Even if John's baptism may be parallel to the purification rites of both the Old Testament and the communities behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, the problem is that John's baptism in the New Testament is explained primarily in eschatological terms. And although Josephus explains it as purification within the Jewish context, he leaves out the eschatological aspect. These different interpretations testify to differences on matters of theological principle, but also to the respective writers' different ideas of John's significance.

If the address, "children to Abraham", is seen in the context of traditional self-understanding it implies that John attacked an ethnic interpretation of the covenant. Inherent in the emphasis on ethical behaviour is a rejection of the traditional identity without it being necessarily a widening of covenant to Gentiles. Thus, as a prophet he calls people to turn to God, and has an imminent judgment in mind. He calls not the few and faithful, but Israel as a whole. From the standpoint of the future judgment, the past is irrelevant. Since there is also no evidence for John building a present social institution or community of the faithful, ecclesiological belonging is secondary to eschatological salvation.

There is a challenge to identity when forgiveness is promised outside the cultic context. Thus, ritual boundaries are challenged especially when baptism takes place on divine command, promising escape from judgment. If this means that baptism replaces the sacrificial forgiveness, it also means that baptism is not a rite of initiation. Rather it symbolises participation in eschatological salvation, and is hence is a preparatory, purificatory rite. It is conspicuous that there seems to be no direct link to Paul, who never uses the term μετανοία when he refers to Christian baptism. Thus I conclude: it has not been possible to trace a clear pattern of inter-dependence between covenant identity and boundaries in the Baptist material. Since John's baptism reflects the idea of a symbolic boundary crossing it seems less relevant as a background to Paul.

PART C

PAULINE CHRISTIANITY:

COVENANTAL IDENTITY AND RITUAL BOUNDARIES.

Above in Parts A and B I reviewed the Jewish background, using texts from the Old Testament, from the pseudepigraphical Book of Jubilees, and from the Dead Sea Scrolls: 11QTemple, The Damascus Document and The Community Rule. I looked briefly at John the Baptist as a figure within this same background. So far I have concentrated my analysis on the two issues, identity and boundaries. By examining how the covenant was used as an identity term and how covenantal belonging was reflected in boundary rites, I demonstrated that there was a change from ethno-centric to particularistic self-understanding, made clear by the shift in emphasis, from covenant valid for all Israel to covenant applied to part of Israel. In the texts I analysed there was no interest in the Gentiles, the concern being with Jewish identity. I also concluded, in general terms, that when identity changed from a broad to a narrow self-understanding this was reflected in the way ritual boundaries changed, from being marks of birth to marks of choice and commitment. While covenant relationship in these writings was horizontal and vertical, building both on the experience of a shared relationship to God and on the social dimension of belonging to a community of shared belief and practice. Boundaries applied mainly to social belonging. Consequently, concrete covenant belonging was manifest in visible boundary markers: in circumcision marking affirmation of being born within the covenant as opposed to the Gentile world outside it; in rites symbolising covenant entry and its restoration for Israel or part of Israel; or in water rituals signifying that cleansing was a prerequisite condition for consecration to holiness.

In Part C, Chapters Six and Seven, I shall trace the same two issues of covenant identity and ritual boundaries as these occur in the Pauline letters. The aim is to examine Paul's use of διαθήκη and to investigate whether the same pattern of interdependence between identity and boundaries can be applied to Paul, and to explore what kind of ritual Paul links to Christian ecclesiological belonging. I shall limit my analysis to the direct use of *diatheke*[1] in the genuine letters by Paul,[2] and thus look at these as they bear witness to Christian identity.

When Paul is considered against his Palestinian background, especially the covenant motif of divine guarantee, it is conspicuous that he never questions the divine origin and establishment of the covenant, nor its

[1] The indirect use of the covenant we find in several related issues, e.g. reconciliation, atonement, justification, purification, law observation (especially Sabbath and circumcision). However, an attempt to pursue all these is too comprehensive a task for this study.

[2] Thus the deuteropauline use in Eph 2,12 is not dealt with.

eternal validity. This raises a number of questions, to be answered below in Chapter Six and Seven: Is the God Paul refers to the God of his Jewish heritage? If so, does he see the covenant as relationship with God in the same way as his background? Does he deviate substantially from his Jewish background, when Christ is a key to his interpretation of scripture? When he uses the same terminology for God, does he reinterpret it as having a different meaning to that which his background assumes? If he does, does this mean that the covenant relationship no longer has the focus it had in the Jewish context, and that covenant identity is substantially reinterpreted? Is the covenant from Paul's point of view a usable identity term in the Christian context? Since Paul actually uses the term, scholars often unreflectingly give an affirmative answer; this, however, will not suffice, as subsequent questions arise: What, in the light of the Jewish background, does the Pauline covenant terminology really stand for? To what extent is it the same idea? To what extent is it radically changed? And finally, How does this influence the setting of covenantal boundaries?

The motif of covenantal promise is particularly important as background to Paul. Since he clearly draws on this motif, particularly in his reference to the Abrahamic covenant, this raises several questions: Does Paul interpret identity in the light of an ethno-centric or a particularistic covenant idea? Is identity based on the idea of a universalistic covenant, ignoring the common ethnic background? How does Paul interpret the concrete promises of land and offspring? Given the fact that the promissory aspect is the most prominent covenantal motif in Paul's theology, how does this influence his view of boundaries? As for the obligatory aspect, the questions are: Does Paul show a tendency towards formulating identity in broad or narrow terms of commitment with the result that boundaries are drawn accordingly? More precisely, does Paul's reinterpretation of covenant traditions lead to a redefinition of boundaries? If yes, in what way? If no, where does it lead? Does Paul define boundaries for a Christian community on a different principle than that which his background presupposes?

Finally, the motif of newness. How far is Paul's concept of boundaries influenced by the Old Testament tradition of spiritual circumcision? Does Paul redefine circumcision or replace it as a ritual boundary? What role does Old Testament symbolism of cleansing and holiness play? Does baptism signify affirmation of an already existing, but broken, covenant relationship or does it symbolise a different relationship? Does it mark a change of identity? What does baptism accomplish?

CHAPTER SIX

COVENANT AND COVENANTS IN PAUL'S LETTERS.

My concern in this chapter is to let the Jewish background throw light on Paul's dual use of "covenant" and "covenants". I shall follow the same approach to the Pauline texts as used in parts A and B above. Basing my exegesis on a textual analysis of Paul's letters I shall now look at Paul's use of διαθήκη with the purpose of clarifying whether "covenant" is also a fundamental category of identity for Paul. I shall attempt an interpretation of the covenant idea based on Romans, Galatians and 2 Corinthians, point to its theological validity, and demonstrate that a soteriological interpretation is neither satisfactory, nor methodologically sound if covenant is a category of identity.

After a brief introductory perspective on Paul, I shall start with Romans, because this comes across as the most balanced and the least polemical letter.[1] I then move to the more polemical letter, Galatians, with its antithesis of two covenants. And because the most controversial passage on covenant in Paul's letters is found in a highly polemical section of 2 Corinthians, qualifying covenant as both "new" and "old", I shall deal with this contrast last. The key questions are: To what extent does Paul build on his Jewish heritage and interpret covenant as a term for the vertical relationship with God? To what extent does Paul interpret the covenant horizontally as a term for Christian identity?

I. Perspective on Paul.

When approaching Paul as a writer I shall presuppose that his writings are letters with different backgrounds that account for Paul's variable use of "covenant". The receiving partners are not imaginary but real, be they communities of Gentiles, Jews or both. Different ecclesiological contexts give rise not only to different interpretations of what scriptural tradition Christian identity builds on, but also to how present and future identity is perceived.[2] Thus, I shall presuppose that Paul's views on identity cannot be

---

[1] I concur with the view that in Romans Paul is neither in opposition to the community in Rome, nor to a group within that community, rather he is appealing to the Romans, who are acknowledged to be "full of goodness, filled with all knowledge and able to instruct one another" (Rom 15,14, cf. 1,8.12). See Sigfred Pedersen, *ZNW* 76, 1985, esp. p.64.

[2] For a general introduction see Werner Georg Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 1980; H. Conzelmann, A. Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch*, 1979.
For discussions of the individual letters, their recipients, their date, their purpose and special character I refer to the major commentaries, cf. my bibliography, part III.

isolated from their Jewish background. If they are, the danger is that the influence of this background is overlooked and neglected. Moreover, unless we are aware of this background we may start by having the wrong impression of what Paul argues for and against, particularly when he uses the phrase "new covenant".[3]

By not following the chronological order of Paul's letters, I have the advantage that I can raise the question of identity from the point of view of it being related to theological reflections as well as to social belonging. Furthermore, from the perspective of self-understanding the order in which the letters were originally written is of less importance. The more mature and reflective letter may help throw light on the meaning implied in other contexts. The more polemical utterances may have a tendency to distort the opponents' views and therefore be misinterpreted as anti-Jewish.[4]

In the texts interpreted so far covenant has been a term for collective relationship with God. The main problem when one approaches Paul is that covenant is not among his most central ideas, a difficulty I am aware of. In order to demonstrate that Paul's understanding of covenant as relationship with God has a bearing on his understanding of group-identity I shall briefly note how his idea of God influences his ideas of both covenant and identity. The fact that Paul moves both within and beyond tradition when he reuses and reinterprets the covenant term, shows that he assumes a belief in God as subject to the established covenant relationship with Israel. However, it is clear that Paul not only understands God's central activity in relation to ethnic Israel but also relates it to the resurrection of Jesus. On the one hand, Paul uses a traditional way of describing God's creative power and activity, or God's caring and saving acts for Israel when he quotes scripture or alludes to it.[5] On the other hand, he also uses a

---

[3] This point I shall return to in Section IV on 2 Corinthians.

[4] Thus, the standpoint of J. Behm, *TDNT* II, 1964, p.130, that Paul uses the covenant concept "as a weapon in the battle to defend the superiority of Christianity over Judaism", which I take as a misunderstanding of Paul, as a distorted picture of the reality of the early church, and as representative of an out-of-date type of scholarship.

[5] The traditional Old Testament use is an aorist participle, e.g. ποιήσας, with reference to creative activity. This is often seen in the hymnic material as, LXX Ps 113,15; 120,2; 123,8; 133,3; 135,5; 145,6. Cf. Jer 10,12.
The aspect of care can be seen in the use of for instance, ἐξηγορας or (indicative) ἐθυτρώσατο as in LXX Ps 135,11.24, or ἐξηγαγών in Deut 5,6, which focus on deliverance from Egypt.
Further Prayer of Manasseh, v.2; Joseph and Asenath 12,3; 1QH 1,9-14; 16,8, cf. 13,8-19.
For Paul God's role in the deliverance from Egypt is presupposed in e.g. Rom 9,14-18, 1 Cor 10,1-13 and 2 Cor 3,7-11.

different and unconventional vocabulary, to which for instance his use of ἐγειρας testifies.[6] Because the activity of God is described by means of this new verb, the emphasis has changed. God's power is not just God manifest to Israel as a people, but rather God acting as giver of life, for a past, present and future humanity, for the whole created world.[7] When the central focus of God's activity is Jesus, that is God's raising Jesus, the perspective has shifted. God is described in terms of God's relationship with humanity, exemplified in the Christ event, and not only with one nation. It is noteworthy that this description stands along with the previous descriptions, not as a replacement for them. By conceptualising God's presence in the Christ event rather than as presence within a people, a fundamental change in the way God is encountered is found. Paul has redefined the idea of God, because he sees humanity's relationship with God differently. Does it follow from this then, that a radical redefinition of identity has taken place? Does this shift mean that ethnocentricity is no longer a foundation for the covenant relationship?

II. Covenant and Israel in Romans.

In this section I shall address the question of covenant validity from an ecclesiological point of view, by narrowing the issue to Paul's use of covenantal terminology in Romans 9-11. I wish to clarify whether there is a positive reuse of one of the important identity categories for Israel as a people. If there is, What does it mean? It is obvious that there are other ways of expressing identity than by means of covenantal terms, as a brief look at the opening section of Romans, the greeting in Rom 1,6-7, will show. At the outset it is important to note that when Paul identifies the recipients of the letter, he does so from the perspective of relationship with God, and in terms of belonging geographically, not in terms of covenant

---

For an analysis of Paul's terminology for God, see Gerhard Delling, in *Studien*, 1970, esp. p.403-6.

[6] ἐγείρας is found e.g. in Rom 4,24; 8,11; cf. 10,9; 1 Cor 6,14; 2 Cor 4,14; Gal 1,1. Further, Acts 3,15; 4,10; 13,30 using the aorist indicative.
Another example is "Father" qualified as "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ", which does not exclude that Israel too has a child relationship to God, as in Rom 9,4: "to them belong the adoption". However, the special relationship of Jesus is stressed more often, most prominent in Gal 4,6; Rom 8,15.
Further examples of a changed vocabulary given by Gerhard Delling, Ibid., and p.417-24. Also David M. Bossman, *BTB* 18, 1988, p.67-75, esp. p.73.

[7] The universal aspect has been noted also by Gerhard Delling, Ibid., p.408. Moreover, a universal aspect is found in the idea that God has reconciled the world to him/herself, in 2 Cor 5,18-19, as an act from God. Since the initiative is on God's side, relationship to God is not based on human atoning efforts, but on God's love, thus redefined as a reversed relationship. See Andreas Lindemann, *ThGl* 69, 1979, p.357-76, esp. p.367-68.

membership.[8] In accord with the practice in antiquity Paul opens the letter by describing first his own status as "called to be an apostle" and "set apart for the gospel of God", thereby showing the readers in what capacity he appeals to them. Thus he identifies himself according to what he sees as his task as a preacher of the gospel, which then is identified according to its content, its continuity with past traditions, its universal scope, and its message of hope for resurrection; hence the reference to the scriptures and the identification of Jesus as descendant of David and as son of God in power. Simultaneously Paul defines the recipients of the letter, first in terms of geographical belonging, Rome; secondly as ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ and κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, thus clearly stressing their relationship with God. By combining "loved by God" and "called to be holy", and adding the purpose, to "belong to Jesus Christ", Paul indicates that fundamentally status is God-given. There is no explicit assertion of covenantal identity. Although a covenant relationship may be implied in both terms, ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ and κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, seemingly an echo of the father-son terminology,[9] it is the common belonging to Christ, not belonging to the covenant, to which Paul relates ecclesiological identity. In short, the introduction to Romans shows that identity is based on present belonging to Christ, on being set apart for holiness as both a present status and a future goal. Past traditions identify God, Jesus, and Paul's message, all indirectly related to ecclesiology. What then is the role of the covenant?

Numerous studies have dealt with Romans 9-11 and noted its special concern for Israel, each having a special point of concern.[10]

> Excursus on Romans 9-11. Since the literature on Romans 9-11 is vast, I shall not attempt to give a complete list, but be selective and point to some works of relevance to the question of identity.
>
> 1. Johannes Munck's *Christ and Israel*, 1967, is still important, less because of its context of salvation history, than because it points to the missionary context. Thus Munck affirms the dialogical background to Romans 9-11, "a three way discussion involving the Gentiles, Judaism and Christianity" (p.8). Munck's interpretation of 9,30-10,4 as a reference to the earthly Jesus is generally not accepted, but it is worth noting that he avoids making the Jews guilty of the crucifixion, and sees the

---

[8] Paul's purpose with the letter, is to seek support, financial and spiritual, for his mission (cf. 1,8-15 and 15,14-33). Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, *NTM* 10, 1956, p.44-60, esp. p.47; Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.13; Sigfred Pedersen, *Kompendium*, 1987, p.2.

[9] Thus there is an echo in ἀγαπητός which in Gen 22,2 is a designation for Isaac, who embodies the fulfilment of the covenant promise; and also an echo of the covenant promise in ἅγιος, the qualifying adjective to Israel as ἔθνος, in Exod 19,6, (cf. also Lev 19,2; 20,7).

[10] For a useful overview of recent research and further literature see Heikki Räisänen, in *The Social World*, 1988, p.178-206; Robert Jewett, *Interpr* 39, 1985, p.341-56.

event as due to a "misunderstood" zeal on their behalf. Of note is Munck's distinction between a true Israel and a power hostile to Israel (p.41) which is present from the time of the patriarchs, for instance in the identification of Esau with Israel's enemy, Edom. The same antagonism is found in the opposition contemporary to Paul; hence the distinction, "the true Israel" and "the hardened Israel". Interesting also is his excursus, Israel as Persecutor (p.49-55). Here Munck not only identifies the Jewish opposition as a lack of belief in Jesus as Messiah, but also as a Jewish opposition persecuting Jews who had become Christian seeing this belief as a false belief, or as a new religion, and not merely a Jewish sect (p.55).

2. Both Krister Stendahl's *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*, 1976, and Nils Alstrup Dahl's article, The Future of Israel in *Studies in Paul*, 1977, are critical of their own Lutheran tradition with its tendency to interpret Romans from the perspective of law and gospel (Stendahl, p.25-28 and Dahl, p.142). For Stendahl the central issue is the inclusion of both Jews and Gentiles. Thus he operates with a distinction between church and synagogue, with a Jewish people that coexists with the church (p.40). For Dahl the main point is that God justifies the ungodly, who are to be found among both Jews and Gentiles (p.146). There is no basis for a belief that Gentiles are called to be "a new people" (p.158).

3. Also from a Lutheran background is Heikki Räisänen, cf. the two almost identical articles in *ANRW* II 25,4, 1987, and in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 1988. His distinction between "empirical" and "eschatological" Israel leads him to conclude that Paul contradicts himself in maintaining that "empirical Israel" (identified as Esau) has "never been elected", and that "eschatological Israel" will be saved. The purpose of Paul's mission is to include "eschatological Israel" in God's salvation.

4. E.P. Sanders' role in pointing to Paul's background in Judaism is widely acknowledged. Of note is his conclusion, in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 1977, that Paul's critique of the Judaism of his day is that of a Christian Jew. He distinguishes further in *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People*, 1983, p.172-76, between three groups, Israel "according to the flesh", a believing Israel and believing Gentiles. The church may in a sense be called "true Israel", but he prefers to call it "a third entity" defined as "neither Jews nor Gentiles". The "people of God" consists of both Gentiles and Jews.

5 From a Jewish perspective Alan F. Segal's *Rebecca's Children*, 1986, is an interpretation of the struggle and conflict over Jewish and Christian identity which result in a separation into two communities, a twin way of salvation (p.158). Both can claim "Israel" as a term for themselves, because it is primarily a notion of universality.

6. For Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*, 1986, "Israel" has an ambiguous meaning. This is due to the fact that he takes Romans as an appeal to "Jewish Christians" to separate from the "Jewish community" and form a union with the "Gentile Christian Community". On the one hand, "Israel" consists of the "elect", the Jews and the Gentiles who believe. Since the Jews who do not believe are no longer part of election they are not "Israel". On the other hand, because Paul is not consistent, the "Jewish community" is set aside only temporarily to make room for the Gentiles, with the ultimate purpose of saving "Israel", "the Jews", in the eschaton.

7. Finally, James D.G. Dunn, who is more nuanced. See for instance his *The Partings of the Ways*, 1991, p.148-49, in which he defines "Israel" in terms of election. For him "Israel" clearly is a term that transcends

the Jew-Gentile division because it is a term of continuity. Because he sees both "Christianity" and "Judaism" as in a process of development and parting from each other he can take "Judaism", defined as covenant and law, to be distinct from "Israel", defined as covenant and grace. For Paul those Jews who do not respond to the covenant promise may have lost their rights to be heirs to the promise, but it is not therefore said that they no longer are "Israel".

Although there is an awareness among scholars that Romans 9-11 does not simply contain theological ideology, that for instance a social context needs to be considered, theological answers are still very much in the foreground. This is particularly the case when covenant is defined soteriologically in general,[11] and in terms of righteousness in particular.[12] An alternative and better way to proceed is to interpret covenant in sociological and theological terms, and look at Paul's use of covenant in a context of the identity of Israel,[13] of Israel's claim to covenantal status in particular.

(1) The validity of God's Covenant.

Romans 9-11 consists of three main parts: (1) the problem of Israel's lack of faith by reference to the tradition, 9,6-29; (2) the present hardening of Israel, 9,30-10,21; (3) the hope for the salvation of Israel, 11,1-32. Paul's arguments consist of questions and answers and they seem to revolve around two questions, "Has the word of God failed?" And "Has God rejected His People?"[14] By asking these questions, Paul is concerned with Israel's present status, its lack of faith, as opposed to the Gentiles' faith, a paradox which he tries to solve by arguing theologically. Moreover, he draws attention to God's sovereignty and power by identifying divine gifts made to both Israel and the Gentiles in the past, present and future. Hence his reference to salvation. However, from the point of view of salvation, neither Israel's past privileges, and thus its status as people of God, nor the Gentiles' present status, pictured as "branches grafted into the olive tree", are reasons or causes for the ultimate hope for salvation. Rather, Paul defines this hope by identifying God as love or mercy; hence the

---

[11] This is mainly due to the influence and impact of "covenantal nomism". Thus E.P. Sanders gives a definition of covenant as the community of the saved which leads to institutionalising both covenant and salvation: "By 'covenantal nomism' I intend to describe the view according to which salvation comes by *membership* in the covenant, while obedience to the commandments *preserves* one's place in the covenant." (Author's italics.) See *Jews, Greeks*, 1976, p.41; *Paul*, 1977, p.75.422.

[12] Thus, James D.G. Dunn, in *ANRW* II.25.4, 1987, p.2842-2890, and in *Romans* II, 1988, p.586-88. sees righteousness in Rom 10,1 as a covenant term.

[13] For the time being I shall define Israel as ethnic Israel.

[14] Cf. 9,6 and 11,1. Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, *NTM* 10, 1956, whom Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert*, 1990, p.276, refers to.

expression, "God has imprisoned all in disobedience so that he may be merciful to all" (11,32). So when Paul summarises, in the concluding doxology in 11,33-36, he makes a reference to God's actions and ways as "unsearchable" and "inscrutable". By interpreting God's actions, Paul not only identifies God's nature, but he also, albeit indirectly, refers to God as covenant partner. Why does he not elaborate the idea of a covenant relationship further? Is the concept in general simply not important for Paul?[15] Or are there other reasons? What is the function of covenant in Romans?

The first occurrence of the covenant term in Romans is in 9,4. The immediate context is a personal introduction in 9,1-3 in which Paul identifies himself as a Jew in relation to other Jews, as their brother, and them as "kindred according to the flesh". After this, he lists a number of privileges which identify the Israelites.[16] Thus I translate Rom 9,4-5:

> ...they are Israelites, to whom belong
> the adoption, the visible presence, the covenant,
> the giving of the law, the temple service, and the promise,
> theirs are the patriarchs,
> and of them is the Christ according to the flesh.

Here Paul lists these traditional privileges to characterise the Israelites, choosing a number of abstract terms which presuppose the Old Testament as scripture and imply acts of which God is the subject.[17] This is in itself significant, but the fact that he fails to mention the concrete marks of identity is perhaps even more significant. Thus none of the Jewish distinctive marks is mentioned: circumcision, Sabbath, festivals, purity marks such as food laws, ritual washings, or the temple as centre of holiness, or possession of the land. This may be a first indication of the fact that the issues at stake are wider and more fundamental in character than specific identity marks.

Paul structures 9,4-5 as three relative clauses, (with ὧν, ὧν and ἐξ ὧν). First, a clause containing six terms, consisting of two groups of three placing respectively υἱοθεσία and νομοθεσία at the beginning, δόξα and λατρεία in the middle, and διαθήκη and

---

[15] As maintained by Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.318.

[16] Paul uses ἀδελφός and συγγενής to designate his relatedness to Jews in broad terms. Elsewhere ἀδελφός identifies a person as belonging to the Christian community, see e.g. Rom 1,13.
The terms Ἰσραήλ and Ἰσραηλῖται (e.g. 9,4.6 etc.) are both identity terms with a theological connotation that the term, Ἰουδαῖοι, used primarily by others (e.g. 1,10; 9,24; 10,12), does not have. See Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.172, 174; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 1983, p.460-61; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.526.

[17] See Sigfred Pedersen, *Kompendium*, 1987, p.52.

ἐπαγγελία at the end.[18] Then follow another two relative clauses which add two more privileges, πατέρες and ὁ Χριστός, further qualified as, κατὰ σάρκα and ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, and finally Paul adds a thanksgiving. What does this structure reveal?

There are three ways to interpret this structure. (a) By presenting the content in this way, Paul may wish simply to enumerate eight privileges of equal value, the order being of no particular importance.[19] (b) Paul may wish to point to the parallelism, two sets of three,[20]

A: υἱοθεσία-νομοθεσία,

B: δόξα-λατρεία,

C: διαθήκη-ἐπαγγελία,

in which case the emphasis lies in the similarity of the pairs. When the plural reading, as in the Nestle-Aland edition, is chosen the similarity is clearer. But the problem is that this builds on the assumption that Paul wishes to equate covenant and promise. This may very well be an interpretation that is influenced by Galatians. (c) Paul may have made use of a chiastic structure,[21]

A: the adoption,

B: the visible presence,

C: the covenant,

C^1: the giving of the law,

B^1: the temple service,

A^1: the promise,

in which case the centre around C suggests an identification between covenant and the giving of the law. Likewise between adoption and promise, between presence of God and temple service. The advantage is that the traditional identification of law and covenant is maintained, thus we have a parallel to what we have seen used above in texts from the Jewish back-

---

[18] See Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.128; Folker Siegert, *Argumentation*, 1985, p.122.

[19] See e.g. Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.249 who see this as a careful structure by means of which Paul builds up to a climax with ὁ Χριστός. Cf. also Ulrich Wilckens, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.188.

[20] Stressed by Otto Michel, *An die Römer*, 1978, p.294 who sees a pattern moving from plurality to unity; Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 1977, p.286; James D.G.Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.522.
C.B. Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 1983, p.460, who operates with a group of four parallels rather than three.

[21] Not suggested in any of the commentaries I have used.
For the use of chiasm see the classic study by Nils Wilhlem Lund, *Chiasmus*, 1942. Cf. also Joachim Jeremias, *ZNT* 49, 1948.
Kendrick Grobel, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 1964, p.255-61, demonstrates that Paul used chiasm in Rom 2,5-13.

ground. Further, adoption and promise may be related as in 8,15-16 (cf.4,13-25). However, because the structure is highly ambiguous, it poses problems rather than answers the question of what covenant means. Therefore, the next task is to determine whether Nestle has the correct reading, or whether my reading of "covenant" is correct. Does the singular make sense?

Commentaries agree that the best reading on external criteria is the singular, διαθήκη; nevertheless they suggest plural διαθῆκαι, because on internal criteria they see the plural as the more difficult reading.[22] Although I agree with the observation that the differences at stake are theological,[23] I take issue with the conclusion that plural is to be preferred. I shall try to give an answer to the text-critical problem, of singular or plural form, in the light of a possible contemporary interpretation of covenantal belonging. What might his readers presuppose?

When scholars rule out the singular and prefer the plural, the problem is that they build their conclusion on the assumption that the singular covenant would be understood as a reference to the Sinai covenant, as the covenant *par excellence*.[24] The underlying assumption is further that to identify "covenant" with the Sinai covenant would be obvious;[25] hence "too easy" a reading.[26] These scholars never explain why the singular covenant is too narrow, and may thus presuppose much too broad a view of what Paul had in mind.[27] So, when interpreters suggest that plural "covenants" is best, they

---

[22] See the various commentaries on these text-critical arguments. Influential for the choice of the plural is Bruce G. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 1971, p.519: The plural "was preferred on the grounds that (a) copyists would have been more likely to assimilate the plural to the pattern of instances of the singular number in the series, and (b) plural covenants may have appeared to involve theological difficulties, and therefore the expression was converted to the singular number."
For an exceptional reading of covenant as singular, see Lucien Cerfaux, in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux* II, 1954, p.348-52; however, he prefers the sense, "testament", because this conveys best the divine initiative.
The fact that the choice, in v.4, between διαθήκη or διαθῆκαι has caused problems from early on, as the apparatus in Nestle shows, points to more than grammatical or stylistic problems.

[23] As expressed by Metzger, cf. previous note.

[24] E.g. C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 1983, p.462; C.K. Barrett, *Romans*, 1991, p.166; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.527.

[25] As noted by Dunn, Ibid, a Jewish reader would think of the Sinai covenant.

[26] Although Calvin Roetzel, *Bib* 51, 1970, p.377-90, draws attention to the lack of use of plural in the background material, he nevertheless does not question the Nestle text, but solves the problem by suggesting that διαθῆκαι should be translated, statutes, ordinances, or perhaps oaths, a solution that is not convincing.

[27] The references to numerous Old Testament texts blur the issue, as e.g. in C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 1983, p.462.

refer either to the many historical events in which God established covenants with the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,[28] or with Noah, Moses, David etc.[29] The possibility that Paul refers to "new" and "old" is also considered.[30] Be this as it may, the heart of the matter is whether Paul refers to plural covenants from an overall perspective of historical succession and replacement, whether he, as in Galatians, sees covenants in tension, or prefers a singular covenant for theological reasons.

Rather than reading διαθῆκαι in the plural, I prefer the alternative given in the Nestle apparatus, διαθήκη in the singular.[31] The main reason is that Old Testament writers, as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls, never use ברית in the plural.[32] The norm here is covenant in the singular. This has been overlooked, or not given sufficient weight.[33] What needs to be considered is

---

[28] Cf. Already Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.128, note 4.

[29] Thus C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans*, II, 1983, p.462; Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.172.
C.K. Barrett, *Romans*, 1991, p.166, interprets covenants as the three great covenants of Exodus.
Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, interprets διαθῆκαι as "*notae* der Israelschaft", p.18, and has the important observation that Paul retains this as an overall or general term for privilege, with eyes on the past. Where Paul is specific on election, as in Rom 2,17ff and 3,1ff., he does not use covenant.

[30] This depends on whether one accepts that Paul elsewhere refers to "old" and "new" covenants. Thus Eldon Jay Epp, in *Christians Among Jews*, 1986, p.80-89, esp. p.83.

[31] I could argue that Paul used the plural and referred to covenants in a context of theological principles and discuss the matter from the particular point of view that Paul had in mind the adjectives "old" and "new", as is one of the suggestions in James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.527. The problem is that Paul avoids both these adjectives, either because the emphasis in Romans is on God's sovereignty in general, cf. Ulrich Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis*, 1968, p.272, or because Paul gives a corrective interpretation, as I shall argue.

[32] Cf. my Introduction, I.

[33] Although it is often noted, for instance by Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief*, 1977, p.287, Otto Michel, *An die Römer*, 1978, p.295, that the plural is used in Wisd 18,22; 2 Macc 8,15 and Sir 44,18, the problem is that the references should be used with care. These texts are late texts and use the plural with qualifications, not unspecified as Paul does. Moreover, as already Annie Jaubert, *Alliance*, 1963, p.313, pointed out, διαθήκη is in the LXX used to render both ברית and חוק. The one occurrence in Wisd 18,22 where oaths and covenants are juxtaposed, is no proof of a theological awareness of plural covenants, rather it seems a matter of style. As for 2 Macc 8,15 there is a clear awareness that διαθήκη stands for a relationship with God, while συνθήκη is used for inter-human relationships, which proves no more than the fact that a change in terminology has taken place. Both Greek terms build on one and the same Old Testament term. The expression "covenants with the ancestors" may well be an incorrect translation of ברית האבות. Thus the LXX of e.g. Deut 4,31 has διαθήκη τῶν πατέρων σου.
As for Sir 44,18 the context refers to Noah, and the plural διαθῆκαι translates חוק, not ברית (cf. 44,12; 45,17).

this: If Paul used the singular he would not need to qualify it. If Paul were to use the unusual plural form he would need to explain this, or qualify it as he does elsewhere. For instance when Paul uses "covenants" in Galatians, he clearly specifies that there are two covenants, qualified as one deriving from Sarah and one from Hagar, further identified as one of freedom and the other of slavery.[34] Why is such a distinction missing in Romans? I suggest that we need to be aware of the fact that the choice of plural takes the sting out of Paul's argument.

From the point of view of the readers, it seems likely that they would understand the singular to refer to one particular covenant, namely that associated with Sinai. It is therefore not unlikely that Paul deliberately uses "covenant" in this sense and thus accepts a limited view of what covenant is. Alternatively expressed, he uses the singular covenant because he assumes his readers' historical interpretation. This can be demonstrated by pointing to a number of specific and clear Exodus allusions in 9,4-5. A comparison with Jubilees may illustrate the point further.[35] Thus Paul chooses (1) *υἱοθεσία*, by means of which he summarises Israel's status before God, with a particular view to Exod 4,22-23 with its use of *πρωτότοκος*;[36] (2) *δόξα*, by means of which he shows a consciousness that, as in Exod 16,7.10, God is visible presence, even at a time before the actual establishment of the covenant takes place;[37] (3) *διαθήκη*, by means of which he makes a deliberate play on Exod 19,5, because the singular covenant signals identity in a special way;[38] (4) *νομοθεσία*, by means of which he sums up the giving of the law in Exod 20;[39] (5) *λατρεία*, by means of which he refers to the giving of the laws for worship, particularly the cultic laws, the rules for making the tabernacle and for the consecration of priests in Exod 25-31, culminating with the handing over of the two tablets of the covenant (31,18); and (6) *ἐπαγγελία*, by means of which he can point backward to God's promise that God will be present within Israel and that Israel is to be *ἔθνος ἅγιον* (cf. Exod 19,5-6), and forward to his interpretation in 11,26-

---

[34] See below in III.

[35] There are remarkably few references to Jubilees in the commentaries.

[36] For the same idea see Jub 1,25, quoted above, Chapter Two, I (2) (c). This reference is noted by James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.526. Ulrich Wilckens, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.188, notes Jub 2,20, but he prefers to see Romans 9 against the background of election.

[37] Jubilees' opening and setting refers to the glory of God, cf. 1,2.3, as an echo of Exod 24,15-18.

[38] It seems that Paul uses Exod 19 rather than Exod 24 as in Jubilees.

[39] Cf. Jub 1,1.

27.[40] If the plural reading, "promises" is preferred, there may be an allusion to the double promise of land and offspring given to Abraham.[41] In both cases Paul has moved from the historical event to the theological level of promise, from a particular occasion that brought the people into existence, to the fundamental idea that Israel's covenant identity rests on divine guarantee.

Another question is whether or not Paul uses covenant in the singular in order to make his readers think in abstract terms.[42] If he does, this would build on the idea prevalent in the Jewish background that takes covenant as God's one covenant with all Israel, or part of Israel.[43] If covenant is thus also identified by his readers as law, Paul may have wanted them to dissociate the singular covenant from the idea of the broken covenant;[44] in that case he can stress covenantal validity as well as retain the authority of the Sinai revelation. If Jews, or other Christians contemporary to Paul, expected either a renewal of the broken covenant based on Jeremiah, or interpreted renewal as human affirmation, along the lines of the Dead Sea Scrolls with their rites for covenant affirmation and entry, then similar ideas of the lack of validity of the covenant could have been present also in a Christian context. If the Jeremiah passage was understood as a prophecy of a future covenant relationship with ethnic Israel, one way to read it would be to interpret Israel as being no longer inside God's covenant, with no claims upon the promises. Is there evidence for such a reading?

Evidence for the use of similar ideas can be found elsewhere. Thus Hebrews uses Jeremiah to support the idea of two covenants, "new" opposed to "old", "new" replacing the "old". The view here is that the old covenant was invalidated, superseded by a new and better, whereby the old was made obsolete. The full quotation from Jeremiah (LXX 38,31-34) in Hebr 8,8-12 shows that this text was used here to reinterpret the covenant in terms of replacement, only a nuance away from rejection, by a writer almost contemporary to Paul. Outside the New Testament there is clear evidence in the epistle of Barnabas, both in 4,6-8 and 14,1-9, of an interpretation that takes the

---

[40] Cf. The promise in Jub 1,17, quoted above, Chapter Two, I (2) (c).

[41] Cf. Chapter One II (2).

[42] Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift*, 1986, p.309-12, shows how plural refers specifically to Old Testament texts, to specific covenant traditions, whereas the singular refers to the principle, as almost an abstraction.

[43] For this usage there is plenty of evidence, as I have demonstrated above in Chapters Two, Three and Four.

[44] Cf. Jer 31,32, LXX 38,32, with its reference to the consequences of the broken covenant, cited above in Chapter One, II (4).

covenant (singular) as broken already at the time of the Exodus, in the incident of the golden calf. As a result of this, Israel lost its rights, and the covenant was given to "us".[45] Although this letter is later,[46] it seems to draw on older traditions, possibly anti-Jewish in character.[47]

Assuming that the idea of Israel being rejected by God goes back to a time contemporary with Paul, and that such a rejection could find support in the Jeremiah passage, I suggest that this might be taken as evidence for a condemnation of Israel, a call for exclusion. My hypothesis is, that Paul in fact opposes a similar view, and therefore reinterprets the covenant as a covenant of promise in order to refute such an idea.[48] This would explain why Paul does not quote Jer 31 in Romans 9-11, only alluding to it in 2 Corinthians, and in Rom 11 uses the combined quotation from Is 59,20-21 and 27,9, to prove that the covenant remains valid for Israel.[49] If the starting point for Paul is others' claim that God has rejected Israel, then it makes sense to proceed, from 9,6 onwards, with election as God's act of love and mercy, rather than as an act of reward-revenge.[50] It is noteworthy that election is not explained as election of spiritual Israel as opposed to

---

[45] Further evidence for an anti-Jewish tradition is found in Barn 13,1-6 which refers to Esau and Jacob as types for two peoples, and interprets the story in terms of rejection of Israel.

[46] Approximate date is 80-135 AD.

[47] See Hans Windisch, HNT *Ergänzungsband*, 1920, p.323, who takes the issue as an issue of the past, and suggests that Barnabas includes an older tradition from an anti-Jewish testimony source.
Note, that the tradition of the two people, one deriving from Jacob, the other from Esau, is found in Barn 13,1-7.

[48] Against Heikki Räisänen, *ANRW* II 25,4, 1987, p.2896; *The Social World*, 1988, p.181: "In the light of his other letters and of the very next verses after 9:1-5 it would seem that Paul pays lip service to Israel's privileges in 9:4-5."

[49] See Norbert Lohfink, *Bund*, 1989, p.75-94. A stimulating book with fresh insight.

[50] As in CD 2,7-9.
It is a mistake to interpret, as for instance Räisänen (cf. previous note but one), Rom 9,6-29 to be a rejection of Israel and in contrast to 9,4-5.
The main problem with this view represented here is that it equates covenant and election. One way out is to avoid the identification which leads to exclusiveness and instead interpret election as God's act of love opposed to human envy and self-exclusion, and not opposed to God's hate. What the story of Jacob and Esau illustrates is that God's choice led to Esau's hate and subsequent persecution of Jacob.
See especially Johannes Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 1967, p.14-22, who points to the a parallel in Jesus' parables (cf. Luke 15,11-32; Matt 18,23-35; 20,1-16 and 21,33-41); Sigfred Pedersen, *Kompendium*, 1985, p.54, and Franz Mussner, *Die Kraft*, 1987, p.46-48. If God is the subject for both σκληρύνειν and ἐλεεῖν, then God also has the power to turn hardening into acceptance.

Israel κατὰ σάρκα.[51] Rather election reflects the boundary God creates which then divides Israel, but also cuts across the dividing line between Jew and Gentile.

A closer look at Rom 11,26-27 may throw light on the problem of the singular covenant and its theological use, whether or not covenant has a validity as God's covenant, whether or not covenant is a category for Christian identity.

Paul concludes the whole argument of Romans 9-11, summing it up in 11,25-26a by stating the problem: the hardening of Israel is not permanent. He quotes scripture as proof of this in 11,26b-27, and finally interprets it in 11,28-32. Thus 11,26-27:[52]

ἥξει ἐκ Ζιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος,
ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακωβ.
καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη,
ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

This seems to be more than a random choice of Old Testament texts. If the quotation serves the purpose of showing that salvation is for Israel as a people, πᾶς Ἰσραήλ, then this purpose builds on the idea that God's covenant is still valid, that it will be (or is) established as an act of forgiveness.[53] The point is that "My covenant", a translation of the Hebrew, בריתי,[54] is clearly qualified as forgiveness of sins.[55] The remarkable thing is that Paul uses Isaiah, not Jeremiah 31, to establish this. Later in v.28-32 the point of validity in relation to time is made: just as Israel was loved by God for the sake of its ancestors, so God's love towards Israel is guaranteed now, νῦν, and in the future.[56] In this way "covenant" from Isaiah supports his argument that it is a positive category of identity for

---

[51] See Michael Theobald, *Kairos* 29, 1987, p.7-8, who argues against Gert Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 1983, p.32, for a dividing line within Israel.

[52] The quotation from Isaiah follows LXX closely with the most obvious difference: ἕνεκεν, "on account of", is replaced by ἐκ, "from". These changes need not be Paul's own, but could go back to a pre-Pauline tradition, as Berndt Schaller argues in *De Septuaginta*, 1984, p.201-6.

[53] Possibly there is also an allusion to Ps 14,7.
For an interpretation of πᾶς Ἰσραήλ, see, for instance, Johannes Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 1967, p.136, who takes Israel as a collective category. πᾶς is introduced in Rom 10,12-13, dealing with salvation to those who call upon the name of the Lord.

[54] Translated to Greek παρ' ἐμοῦ.

[55] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.126-27, relates the phrase to both divine ordinance and promise. Berndt Schaller, Ibid., p.205, note 9, has shown that the plural "sins" is rare in Paul's terminology.

[56] Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Ibid., p.12; Hans Hübner, *Gottes Ich*, 1984, points to the identity of the God of "both Testaments", p.121-24.

Israel, as it exists in history, past, present and future.[57] Such a statement is less likely if the point of departure is dialogue with (other) Jews.[58] It seems more likely that Paul opposes other Christians' interpretation of the covenant as broken, or the view that God has rejected Israel. It is clear that Paul is primarily concerned here with Israel's fate, and neither personal nor universal salvation is at issue.[59] The two expressions, "to banish ungodliness" and "to take away their sins", qualified as the work of "the deliverer", are certainly aimed at Israel.[60] In this way the validity of the covenant for Israel is stated, and the rejection of Israel has been shown to have no scriptural foundation.

How does God's covenant in 11,26-27 tie in with the covenant in Rom 9,4-5? Is it an unfulfilled or a fulfilled promise to Israel?

It seems likely that Paul writes about the future with the present situation in mind, not in order to bring comfort to the present congregation.[61] Rather, by referring to a future covenant or to an eschatological order,[62] he re-

---

[57] Paul's use of the Old Testament shows that the text is often used to support rather than to carry the argument. Thus, James W. Aageson, *CBQ* 48, 1986, p.265-89, who emphasises that Paul addresses Christian readers, that his arguments in Romans 9-11 are constructed to meet objections, not to address non-Christian Jews. See also Barnabas Lindars, in *BJRL* 69, 1986-87, p.523-25 and Sigfred Pedersen, in *Skriftsyn*, 1989, esp. p.39-41.

[58] Stressed by Bent Noack, in *Judendom*, 1986, p.237-58, esp.p.238, but already Ernst Lohmeyer, Ibid., p.129, pointed to the "sachlicher Beziehung zu den Judentum".

[59] Zion is best understood as synonym for Israel, cf. Isa 51,16 and 57,13. See Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 1985, p.136-37.
This does not mean that salvation is limited to Israel.

[60] It is difficult to decide whether the deliverer refers to God, as understood by Mary Ann Getty, *CBQ* 50, 1988, p.461, who takes "my covenant" as a reference to Jeremiah and as a fulfilment of the promises to Israel, or whether it refers to Jesus as in Folker Siegert's, *Argumentation*, 1985, p.173. See C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* II, 1983, p.578 and James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.682, for further references.
Probably there is no contrast, rather a conscious ambivalence.
An alternative view is that of Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.212-13, who maintains that the second coming of Christ which will take place in Jerusalem is meant. Cf. also Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.304: "die Wiederkehr des erhöhten Christus aus dem himmlischen Jerusalem von Gal 4,26".

[61] Against Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.304. Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, in *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.153; and J.W. Aageson, *JSNT* 31, 1987, p.51-72, esp. p.63.

[62] Paul's use of σωθήσεται is influenced by the vocabulary and grammar of the quotation, but he is not necessarily limiting himself to the factual future, because fulfilment implies an "already" and a "not yet" of salvation in Christ.

interprets covenant to be of present validity, established as it is by God.[63] In this perspective, Paul can quote Isaiah both as a fulfilled prophecy with a view back to the Christ events, indirectly stating that Old Testament prophecies of forgiveness are already fulfilled; and use it as a guarantee for the future.[64] If this is correct, the concluding part of Rom 11 ties into 9,4-5, to the last privilege, ὅ Χριστὸς, qualified as τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.[65] This qualification of Χριστός is more than a reference to the ethnic origin and historical limitation of Jesus.[66] Rather Paul asserts God's activity in the Christ event of the past. But he also anticipates it as valid for Israel's future. If God's encounter in Christ is a covenant privilege, equally important to other privileges, or perhaps their climax,[67] then this does not refer to a privilege of limited historic validity. So even if Israel has at present rejected its Messiah, Paul's concern is, as in Rom 9,33,[68] to maintain an interpretation of Christ as promise within Israel's covenant relationship. It is of note that Paul does <u>not</u> refer to the universal dimension of the Christ event when he refers to privileges. This dimension is found instead in Romans 10, when Paul states that Christ is "the final purpose of the law" (10,4).[69] Basing his argument on scripture Paul reasons

---

[63] The present tense of εἰμι is used in 9,4, as noted by Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.17. Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.143.

[64] To limit, as most interpreters do, the covenant in its future and/or eschatological dimension, or to the event when Christ reappears to bring the final redemption, seems unlike Paul who in no other passage uses the language of covenant to express such a view.

[65] The question is whether Paul continues and adds the qualification θεός. This would on linguistic grounds be natural, and a possible interpretation. Thus, Johannes Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 1967, p.32; Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.173, who takes the phrase to mean Christ related to God in his functions. For a more detailed discussion of this, see commentaries, above all, William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *Romans*, 1920, p.233-38; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* II, 1983, p.464-70; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* II, 1988, p.528-29.
The most popular interpretation among scholars is the standpoint of Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, that the expression is not part of the enumeration of the privileges of Israel but a statement about God, cf.p.250. But see also Folker Siegert, *Argumentation*, 1985, p.122-23, following C.L. Bauer, *Logica Paullina*, 1774 and *Rhetoricae Paullinae*, 1782, who maintains that τὸ κατὰ σάρκα calls for a positive juxtaposition, hence ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θέος of Christ.

[66] <u>Against</u> Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.20: "Er (Christus) ist ein Signum der Erwählung Israels wie alles zuvor angeführte, das letzte und gewichtigste zwar, aber eben doch ein *signum electionis*. Und der mit dem allem markierte Vorzug Israels ist "geschichtlich-kollektiver", nicht eschatologischer Art".

[67] Note that such a view, cf. N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.327, too easily leads to covenant replacement.

[68] Contains a combined quotation of Isa 28,16 and 8,14,

[69] I accept Robert Jewett's interpretation, *Interpr* 39, 1985, p.341-56, that τέλος has a double meaning, both "goal" and "end".

that salvation is in Christ, and that a covenant of both law and promise finds its purpose in Christ.[70] He concludes in 10,12 with a universal note, that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek in terms of covenantal belonging, but the distinction is based on faith in Christ.

With this a grandiose reinterpretation has taken place, not in a scheme of replacement,[71] but because the two aspects of covenant, the promissory and the obligatory, find a synthesis in Christ.

In short, on the one hand, Paul mentions a number of privileges by means of which he identifies the Israelites. These privileges, including God's covenant, are therefore marks of a God-given identity, significant because they are still valid. And if the last privilege of Israel is the Messiah, the Messiah is also the last mark of identity, a mark confirming God as mercy. On the other hand, Paul makes no attempt to qualify covenant in the context of Romans 9,4-5 as valid beyond Israel. If covenant is one of Israel's privileges, why does Paul not use it more often? Is there behind this an issue of Jewish identity distinct from a Christian identity?

(2) Covenant and Identity in Romans.

If then Paul thinks of the covenant as still valid for Israel, does he also refer to the relationship between God and the Gentiles as covenant? Is covenant restricted to ethnic Israel, so that a different category applies when God calls Gentiles into a relationship? There are two possible answers. Either Paul redefines covenant and makes covenant wider than an ethnic, particularistic relationship, or Christian identity is defined in alternative categories, and in either case covenant may remain an identity term for ethnic Israel. The paucity of direct usage of covenant terminology calls for caution.

The identity issue is complicated, not only because "Israel" is used in more than one sense, but also because Paul is not consistent. On the one hand he begins his exposition by referring to Israel's privileges in 9,4-5, then modifies this by introducing election. Although he bases this on traditions related to identity derived from the Old Testament, he refrains from introducing any of the concrete identity marks.

---

[70] The reference in 10,6 to Deut 30,12, may be taken as an allusion to covenant renewal, the hope for a change of hearts, (cf. Jer 31,31 and Ezek 36,26). In that case Rom 10,9 may also refer to the total renewal the prophets hoped for. Cf. S. Lyonnet, in *Die Israelfrage*, 1977, p.163.

[71] I take issue with what is implied in the interpretation by N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.231-57, esp. p.241-3.

In an attempt to answer the question, "where do we come from?" Paul redefines present identity. Because the past for him is both the Old Testament traditions of ethnic identity and the Christ event, present identity is defined at times in both-and terms, such as ethnic Israel along with non-Israel, sometimes in neither-nor terms, such as Jew-Gentile, distinguishing cultural and religious belonging. This is complicated further when Paul distinguishes between *τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς* and *τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, a distinction based on two opposing principles which modify belonging.[72] By means of this the identity of *τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ* is narrowed down in 9,6-18, first to children of promise exemplified as Isaac, then in the example of Jacob as election opposed to Esau. This mixture of ethnic and theological boundaries serves to focus on God; but the result of such a mixture is that identity is defined in either-or categories, easily interpreted as replacement. This does not seem the best way forward in a dialogue. But it reflects a situation of a community concerned with clarification of identity and theologically defined boundaries.

If I am right that Paul is opposing an interpretation that builds on the idea of replacement, and wants to avoid cutting himself and his community off from the tradition, he is forced to settle the dispute and operate with simultaneous principles. Because one principle rests on God's love, and the other on hostility towards God, he defines identity along lines which cut across prevailing criteria, for Israelites as well as for Gentiles. This is what the example of "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" in 9,33 shows, since it is implied, as in Is 28, that the stone is precious and the foundation for salvation.[73] The alternative identities are here in two categories, *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου* and *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως*.[74] This theological distinction is not based on particularistic belonging, because law and faith as relationship categories ultimately rest on two alternative ways of perceiving their relationship with God, Abraham and Christ being models of faith and Esau the model of hatred. By focusing on God, and God's call to humanity, which significantly is a call to a "service" or love relationship, identity is a faith-relationship. This wider identity can be found in 9,19-29, in which Paul argues from creation. Both by drawing on the imagery of the potter from Jeremiah (18,6), and by quoting Hosea 2,25, Paul changes the perspective from historical covenant to creation. By using the category, children of God, rather than covenant, Paul suggests alternative criteria of identity for both Gentiles and Israel: identity built on being in a personal

---

[72] As in Gal 4,23.29, which I shall deal with below in III.

[73] Cf. Sigfred Pedersen, *Kompendium*, 1987, p.58-59.

[74] For another use of alternative categories of identity, see below in III.

and love relationship, not on belonging to a covenant.

The alternative Paul suggests is belonging defined not in narrow particularistic terms of covenant or election. This is based on Paul's concept of God. By envisaging all humanity in a relationship with God, identity is widened. At the same time, Paul emphasises that identity is defined by faith in Christ, as in 10,10-12. This means that Paul redefines belonging in vertical terms of inclusiveness based on God's calling. And in that case covenant as a particularistic category is no longer wide enough so that it needs to be modified as a category of identity. If its potential for inclusiveness is to be maintained it needs a future dimension, which is the case when identity answers the question, "where do we go?" and takes God's judgment and salvation of the world as the point of departure. When Paul redefines belonging in theological terms of exclusiveness and sociological separation is the result, the reason may have been a competition between the Jewish community and the Christian church.[75] But it is more likely that Paul here argues for a theological boundary within the communities of the children of God, of both Jewish and Gentile background.[76] If he does, ecclesiological identity is redefined to emphasise that being a Christian means being marked by God for service and love for the world, and to this end a local community of shared faith functions as a unifying factor.

If for Paul "children of God" is an alternative category of identity this explains the absence of explicit usage of covenant. Besides this ties in with the introduction to the letter. If the identification in Rom 1,7 is ecclesiological, identity means only one thing, a child-parent relationship with God, modeled on Christ, inclusive of both Israel and Gentiles. What Paul sees fulfilled or restored by Christ is the relationship of creation, as summed up in Rom 8,17: "and if children, heirs as well, heirs of God, heirs along with Christ- for we share his sufferings in order to share his glory."[77] This means identity has its origin in a divine vocation, and its

---

[75] If Francis Watson, *Paul,* 1986, is right in maintaining that Paul appeals to Jewish Christians to separate from the Jewish community and join with the Gentile Christians.

[76] The way William S. Campbell reads Romans, suggests that Paul appeals to a reorientation of both Jewish and Gentile Christians, because God sets the terms for salvation. See *Paul's Gospel,* 1991, p.122-31. However, this is equally an *ad hoc* solution that reflects the New Testament situation of a hostile Jewish opposition.
The contemporary situation needs to reformulate identity as belonging to the same family, Jews and Gentiles elected not in exclusion from each other but alongside each other, for the sake of the world. For this appeal, see J. Christiaan Beker, *PSB Suppl Issue* I, 1990, p.40-55.

[77] Translation James Moffatt. Cf. 8,29.
As noted by Anna Marie Aagaard, *Identifikation,* 1991, p.17-23. Sufferings

goal in conformity to the image of the son. When both origin and goal refer to ecclesiological identity, belonging to God is redefined as a child relationship. When identity is further illustrated with the metaphor of the olive tree, this is used as an ecclesiological model of unity and diversity in which social relationship has God's holiness as its root and bearing fruit as its goal;[78] hence Israel does not exist for its own sake, it exists for the sake of the mission to the world.[79] The same goes for the church.

In sum. By making a deliberate choice of terms in 9,4-5 Paul has presented the issue of covenant in two ways. On the one hand, he defines Israel's identity in terms of historical privileges. This identity is fundamentally ethnic. Integral to this covenantal identity is the people's communal life and social belonging. Since God is a faithful God, covenant is valid for Israel in both past and present. On the other hand, when the Messiah is the privilege of the Israelites, Paul defines their present and future identity in theological terms with a christological hermeneutic. The covenant is established by God with forgiveness as foundation and Christ introduced as promise and privilege. The result is that the emphasis changes, so that identity is no longer according to historical particularistic boundaries. Based on a different idea of relationship with God, Paul can identify present ecclesiological belonging in terms of a child-relationship to God, and state that God calls children from among both Jews and Gentiles (cf. 9,24; 10,12). Although covenant clearly belongs to Israel's historical privileges and is one of its traditional identity categories, Paul nevertheless does not use covenant unambiguously to embrace a Christian identity in Romans. The reason may be that there were attempts to reject its validity for Israel, and thereby question the authority of tradition. This explains why Paul is cautious in his application of covenant in Romans. The conclusion is that covenant is not an obvious category for a changed identity. While a particularistic covenant relationship is confirmed, a clear reinterpretation of covenant as universal or identified as promise and Spirit, found in Galatians, is not present in Romans.

---

should not be interpreted individually. Rather the point is that as church, the community is faced with the reality of persecution and resistance from a hostile society that builds its identity on other values. Further, she points to the late Luther for the idea that the cross, as style of life, is a mark of the church (1 out of 7), (*Von den Konziliis und Kirchen*, 1539).

[78] The image of the olive tree is discussed as an ecclesiological model in Paul S. Minear, *Images*, 1960, p.45-48. He is alert to the difficulty that arises out of an equation of either the church or Israel with any of the items in the image. If the image is taken too allegorically, then the point of diversity in unity may be lost.

[79] Rom 11,16-24. For a discussion of the meaning of this metaphor see Dan G. Johnson *CBQ* 46, 1984, p.91-103.

III. "Children" and "Mothers" of the Covenant in Galatians.

Paul refers in Galatians to the covenant as part of a wider context than in Romans. Thus he uses διαθήκη explicitly in two arguments: (1) in Gal 3,15-18 he plays on διαθήκη both as a legal term, "will", "testament", and as Old Testament term meaning "covenant" as a translation of ברית; (2) in Gal 4,21-5,1 he interprets Genesis allegorically to explain the problem of legitimacy by opposing Hagar and Sarah. Even though Paul's use of the Old Testament traditions has a Jewish background, his interpretation is also different, especially when he is forced into a two covenant scheme. It is of note that Galatians comes across more polemically than Romans, but this is possibly due to different opponents.[80]

The two passages are part of Gal 3,1-5,12 which I take as a unity.[81] Paul's use of διαθήκη appears then in a context that answers the question, Who qualify as children of God? In order to explain the relationship with God, he draws on both scripture and life experience to illustrate who are, and who are not, children of Abraham, and ultimately children of God. Note that the question is not, Who are members of the covenant? As in Romans Paul maintains continuity with past identity by interpreting belonging in the light of Old Testament texts. But although he clearly builds on a Jewish tradition, he also breaks with this tradition.

---

[80] The interpretations of who the opponents are vary. Most scholars would hold the classic view that the opponents were Jewish Christians requiring law observance from Gentile Christians. For details I refer to the various commentaries, above all Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.11-29 and Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.5-9, Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.lxxxviii-c.
For a recent assessment of the issue of opponents, see Nicholas Taylor, *Paul, Antioch*,1992, p.170-76.
As an example of a different view, see Johannes Munck, *Paul*, 1959, p.87-134, who operates with a Gentile Christian heresy as thesis. Be that as it may, his point that the root of the opposition is found in the interpretation of the Old Testament needs to be appreciated. The whole problem evolves from a misinterpretation of the Old Testament and a failure to apply a christological hermeneutic. When the focus is interpretation the opposition could be either Christians with a Jewish background trying to be faithful to the obligations God gave in the past, or Christians, with a Gentile background, who, not understanding their new identity fully, would apply the Old Testament uncritically to a Christian community. (It is a well-known phenomenon that people who join a group by conversion tend to be more conservative than those born within it).

[81] Several commentaries take 3,1-5,12 as a unity. Thus, Jürgen Becker, Franz Mussner, Albrecht Oepke, and Heinrich Schlier.
Hans Dieter Betz builds his interpretation and structure on Greco-Roman rhetoric and accordingly takes Galatians as a single entity. This analysis has been challenged by Joop Smit, *NTS* 35, 1989, p.1-26. He maintains a rhetorical background, but defines the letter not as a judicial defence speech but as a political speech (cf. Cicero) p.5-9, takes 1,6-5,12 as a unit, and 5,13-6,10 as a later addition.

From the point of view of identity this passage contains two related, key issues: inheritance and legitimacy. Paul's discussion is significant not least because of the insight he offers of a Christian identity. This insight is primarily given as an interpretation of the Old Testament, using Christ as the hermeneutical key. Simultaneously he rejects a more traditional hermeneutic. Thus, against an exegesis which seems to identify law and promise, Paul maintains that such an interpretation causes both promise and law to have law as a leading principle (cf. 5,2-4). When Paul instead relates both law and promise to Christ, the result is that both change, so that identity too changes.[82]

Concerning inheritance and legitimacy, Paul gives four statements in Gal 3,1-5,12: (1) being righteous is the foundation of status as children of God; (2) faith in Christ is the foundation for claiming to be heir to Abraham's promises; (3) the covenant promise to Abraham is fulfilled in Christ; and (4) inheritance belongs to those who by virtue of the acts of Christ have inherited freedom. This raises a number of questions relating to covenant and identity: What role does the aspect of ethno-centricity play when Paul uses διαθήκη in Galatians? Is διαθήκη an expression for a covenant relationship which is still valid in the situation Paul addresses? To what extent is there a theology of a restored, replaced or spiritualised covenant? Does Paul operate with exclusive or inclusive terms of identity? And finally, What other criteria for belonging are emphasised? I shall first address the issue of whether covenant is still a valid term. If it is, for whom then is it valid? In short, by using a number of contrast terms, Paul draws out the positive consequences of building on Old Testament traditions, reinterprets identity in relation to faith in Christ; but he is thereby forced into some negative statements of an exclusive nature.[83] Identity

---

[82] Thus law is given a different value, summed up as love (5,15 cf. Lev 19,18) to function on a different level, as ethical norm within the community of the Spirit (5,25).
Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl's observation, that Paul has not changed his former view on both promise and law because of his faith in the crucified Jesus as Christ, *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.176.
Sigfred Pedersen, in *Skriftsyn*, 1989, p.34-35, has made the important observation that when Paul interprets the Old Testament "law" and "promise", in Rom 4,14 and Gal 3,18, as terms of contrast, it is not simply "law" over against "promise"; rather the promissory character of God's law is opposed to the human law. Therefore not only does Paul oppose a different interpretation, but he also abstains from using certain texts which have human law as content.

[83] On one side: law, works, curse, flesh and slavery; on the other side: faith, blessing, promise, Spirit and freedom - contrasted to intensify not only terminological but also theological differences. Characteristically, they all relate to Christ.

builds both on a common tradition and on another principle.

(1) From Promises to Promise. Galatians 3,15.17.

In the passages preceding Gal 3,15-18 Paul is engaged in an interpretation of scripture, in which the story of Abraham is central to the argument. He argues that faith, not law, is the basis of true relationship with God.[84] Having identified the Spirit as the blessing of Abraham's inheritance (cf.3,14),[85] Paul addresses in 3,15-18 the question, To whom is the inheritance promised? He concludes in v.18: "for if the inheritance comes from the law, it no longer comes from the promise, but God granted it to Abraham through the promise."[86] By thus maintaining that Abraham received the promise of inheritance without conditions, Paul can claim that no conditions are inherent in God's promises.[87] This point is further elaborated in 3,29 stressing that those who belong to Christ participate in the inheritance by virtue of having received God's promise.

To reach this conclusion, Paul has made use of two illustrations, one related to human life (v.15), the other to Abraham (v.16). The illustrations are taken from a judicial sphere, which is clear from the vocabulary of the pericope: κυρόω (confirm), προκυρόω (confirm before), ἀθετέω, ἀκυρόω (disannul), ἐπιδιατάσσομαι (add to), καταργέω (make of no effect) and κληρονομία (inheritance). In this context Paul uses διαθήκη twice, apparently in an ambiguous way, since scholars disagree over both meaning and translation. There are three possibilities, 1) the most common view is

---

[84] Abraham is mentioned in Gal 3,6.7.8.9.14.16.18.29; 4,22.
Thus Gal 3,6 quotes Gen 15,6; Gal 3,8 quotes Gen 12,3 (18,8) and Gal 3,14 probably alludes to Gen 28,4. For a detailed analysis see Nils Alstrup Dahl, In *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.171.

[85] For Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.242, the content of the inheritance is the Spirit and the adoption; for Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.159, it "includes all the benefits of God's work of salvation".

[86] Greek has Abraham in an emphatic position. Cf. the German translations given by Becker, Oepke, but not Schlier.

[87] Very often the discussion is taken into a discussion on law, because of the context, at the cost of what covenant means, see Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.240-41, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.158-59, Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.148.
James D.G. Dunn, *BJRL*, 65, 1983, p.95-122 and *NTS* 31, 1985, p.523-42, against E.P.Sanders and Heikki Räisänen, rightly draws attention to the problem of the social function of the law, the law being an identity and boundary marker for Jews separating them from Gentiles and setting them apart as God's people. Thus, he uses Galatians (3,10-14) as a test case, *NTS* 31, p.532-38, to show that Paul is arguing against the law because of the implicit social, national and religious factors which identify the Jewish people as the covenant people, or the people of the law. True as this may be, as I see it, the problem Paul is dealing with when he writes to the Christian Galatians is as much a question of Christian self-understanding from within.

that Paul here uses διαθήκη in the sense of "will".[88] 2) A few maintain the meaning of "covenant" in both instances.[89] 3) Some have both "will/testament" and "covenant", respectively at v.15 and v.17.[90]

There are problems with whatever choice is made. Thus, the problem with 1) is that the illustration does not fit into any legal system in antiquity;[91] the problem with 2) is that a specific Old Testament term is used to address a Gentile audience;[92] and the problem with 3) is that Paul comes across as inconsistent.[93] However, I conclude that even if Paul uses διαθήκη elsewhere, this does not mean he cannot use it differently in various contexts; hence I

---

[88] Or "testament".
Thus, Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.19-20, Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.34, Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.109-10, Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.142, Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.211.321, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.154, in their commentaries.
Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.137, argues against translating διαθήκη into "covenant" (Bund) because of the mutual commitment, and opts for "testament", because of the emphasis on human relations.
See also Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.57 and Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.318-36, who dismisses Gal 3,15-17 as irrelevant because of the metaphorical language, "bildlicher Sprachgebrauch", p.319, note 5.

[89] Particularly in the British tradition, cf. J.B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 1910, p.140. See also Herman N. Ridderbos, *Galatians*, 1976, p.129-30, and Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.177.
A lengthy, but not entirely convincing argument is given by John J.Hughes, *NT* 21, 1979, p.27-96.

[90] Donald Guthrie, *Galatians*, 1981, p.101-3. See also Nils Alstrup Dahl, In *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.172. F.F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 1982, p.168, has to v.15: "testament" and v.17 "testament" or "covenant". Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.181, has in his translation "testament" twice, but in his comment, p.187, he argues for a shift from "testament" to "covenant".

[91] Whether the legal background is Greek-Roman or Jewish is a secondary question, see Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.58-59. Following Heikki Räisänen, against Ernst Bammel, *NTS* 6, 1959-60, p.313-19, he concludes that the comparison limps.
Another difficulty is the meaning of testament when related to God, as a testament from God to Abraham. For even if the emphasis is placed on the validity of a legal testament as mere point of comparison (cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.147; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.158), the death of God is implied. This difficulty has been seen already when manuscripts were copied, adding εἰς Χριστόν as an interpretation, see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 1975, p.594.
Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.113, prefers to disregard this point. Cf. also Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.20.

[92] Albrecht Oepke, Ibid., p.110, believes that Hellenistic vocabulary did not include the biblical meaning of covenant.

[93] For Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.187, the shift from one sense to another is no problem, because of the same shift in the Septuagint's use of διαθήκη. Lars Hartman, in *Die paulinische Literatur*, 1980, finds the change natural with view to inheritance, p.110.

infer that Paul uses a play of words here.[94]

From this range of interpretations to the meaning of διαθήκη, the question is, What does *diatheke* stand for? To answer this the context and the flow of the argument need to be taken into consideration, since Paul himself seemingly gives an explanation in v.17.[95] Thus, because the exposition starts at the human level, 3,15, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, and ends in 3,18, as quoted above, with a reference to what God promised to Abraham, the content of the argument changes. The purpose seems to be to clarify whether law or promise is the leading principle of διαθήκη.[96] Just as the previous passages (v.6-11; v.12-14) alluded to or quoted Old Testament passages as part of the argument, so here too the argument revolves around the Old Testament in general, and the Abraham traditions of covenant promises in particular.[97] Even if Paul starts the argument with a reference to the legal validity of the human will, he clearly does not remain at the level of legal practice when he moves to Abraham and the issue of inheritance. Because ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένη διαθήκη (v.15) is contrasted to διαθήκη προκεκυρομένη ἀπο τοῦ θεοῦ (v.17) διαθήκη is qualified by two different adjectival descriptions, and therefore has two meanings.

On the one hand, Paul argues *a minore ad maius*, from human conditions to

---

[94] Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.146, note 4, who maintains the meaning of testament in 3,15-17, but points to Paul's use elsewhere as related to the LXX, and justifies this as Paul's ability to span more than one meaning of the word. Even if his double translation of "testament" may appear consistent, it makes the interpretation too narrow.

[95] τοῦτο δε λέγω introduces the explanation in v.17. Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.146;Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.182.

[96] Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.143.
Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.110, calls the illustration in 3,15 a comparison (Vergleich) which is not only an illustration but serves the purpose of explaining that salvation is by grace, not law. Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.236, objects to this because he sees κατὰ ἀνθρώπον as a *terminus technicus* introducing the argument which is primarily an argument *a minore ad maius*. See below for this.

[97] Cf. Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.64.
The texts referred to are, Gen 12,2-7; 13,15-16; 15,4-6.18; 17,8; 22,16-19 and 24,7-9 all with references to the blessing and promise of offspring.
Further references to Abraham are found in Sir 44,21; Jub 1,7; 12,22-24; 13,3.19-21; 14,18; 15,9. 4 Ezra 3,13-15.
However, it is impossible to say whether Paul had a specific text in mind in writing this passage. Several scholars are in favour of Gen 17, because of the congruent use of διαθήκη and σπέρμα, thus Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.238-39; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.144-45; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.156-57.
Mussner rightly points also to Gen 22,17 as important, because this text contains the words: κληρονομήσει τὸ σπέρμα, p.238.
Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift*, 1986, p.222, favours Gen 13,15 because of καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου.

divine, from validity on the ordinary human level to validity on a higher level;[98] on the other hand, he does not say that one is valid, the other not. Both are valid on their own terms: as "will", valid on the death of the testator; as "covenant", valid by divine decree.[99] Human validity is contained within divine validity. By interpreting σπέρμα (in singular)[100] he probably alludes to both the Abrahamic and the Davidic covenant.[101] He clearly interprets promise as having a christological and an eschatological meaning.[102] Thus, Paul has turned his illustrations into a theological statement on divine promise. In this way he can maintain the validity of the covenant promise and simultaneously state the promise's superiority to law. The difference between the first and the second use of διαθήκη is primarily one of quality.[103]

From one point of view, the emphasis is on continuity, on the sameness of God who in sending Christ fulfills covenantal promises.[104] From another point of view, there is the otherness of the relationship with God. This is indicated when faith in Christ determines belonging to the community, when the experience of the Spirit is integral to the status of being "children of

---

[98] Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.136; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.144. 146-47; Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, 112; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.236.240.

[99] An important observation is, that διαθήκη no longer serves as a category containing both law and promise, and that therefore διαθήκη as an inclusive category (Oberbegriff) has been superseded, Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.62.

[100] For more details on σπέρμα, I refer to the various commentaries.

[101] It is possible that not only Gen 22,17 but also 2. Sam 7,12 is alluded to, and if that is the case messianic overtones to the interpretation are possible, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, in *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.171. Cf. also Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.157 and Lars Hartman, in *Die paulinische Literatur*, 1980, p.110.
Other references would be e.g. LXX Ps 24,13, Ps 88,4.29.36; Isa 44,3.

[102] Friedrich Lang, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.314, talks about a turn of era ("Äonenwende") brought about by Christ as fulfiller of the promise to Abraham, which brings about the time of freedom and initiates an age of relationship by adoption and of the Spirit.

[103] Cf. Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.63-4. However, it does not follow that the law has a negative function, as Nils Alstrup Dahl, in *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.174, has pointed out: the law as subordinate still has the function to point to Christ as fulfilment.

[104] Cf. 1,4; 2,20; 4,5; 5,1.13.
Christ brings fulfilment to covenant promises, according to 3,16, but note that Paul does not relate the cross, or the supper, to the covenant here.
It may be significant that Paul seems to prefer ἐπαγγελία to διαθήκη as almost identical terms when Abraham traditions are used, Gal 3,14.16.17.18.21.22.29; 4,23.28. Cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.199.
Lars Hartman, in *Die paulinische Literatur*, 1980, p.109-10, interprets the promise as a promise of the Spirit.

God" (cf. 3,26-28; 4,1-7). Both affect a change in the definition of identity and boundaries.

It is significant that when Paul refers to present relationship or identity, he seems to prefer the terms, κληρονόμος, υἱός and τεκνόν for both vertical and horizontal relationships, (cf. 3,7.26.29; 4,4-6.28.31). This is most clear in 3,29: εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.[105] Here Paul claims that identity is determined by inheritance. Since 3,29 can be seen as a climactic conclusion to the whole passage, the same claim is true of 3,15-18. And since the point of inheritance is elaborated once more in 4,1-7, linking adoption, υἱοθεσία (cf. Rom 9,4) to the promise of the Spirit, the context points to a change in identity terms. When the experience of the presence and the power of the Spirit is the proof, or mark of identity, it is also clear that it is by this mark that the Galatians can regard themselves as children of Abraham, children in Christ, children of freedom, children of God.

It is of note that when Paul identifies διαθήκη and promise he does not mention any belonging or entry to the covenant. Because Paul has a comprehensive view of what relationship with God is and what covenant relationship implies, he can no longer define identity in particularistic terms of covenantal belonging.[106] When identity builds on and derives its content from a relationship with God, imaged as Father, such a relationship is open to both Jews and Gentiles. Unlike Romans, there is no attempt here to ensure "Israel's rights" to the inheritance, nor, for that matter, to deny them. Rather Paul demonstrates that Christian identity is wider than ethnic belonging, and simultaneously that it is narrow inasmuch as it is based on faith in Christ.

In short, by drawing on the Abrahamic covenantal traditions, by alluding to the Davidic covenant, and by reinterpreting these traditions, Paul stresses the aspect of promise. Because he sees the Christ event and the encounter of the presence of God in the Spirit as a sign of validity, he can emphasise the validity of God's promise. However, when God's covenant is thus reinterpreted, it becomes a different covenant, mainly because the promises are no longer limited to an ethnic context. Rather, there is one decisive promise, the universal promise of the presence of the Spirit.

Turning now to the image of the "two covenants" I shall ask, Does Paul

---

[105] I shall return to this in Chapter Seven in the context of boundaries.

[106] Lars Hartman, in *Die paulinische Literatur*, 1980, p.112, sees this as more than ad hoc arguments, because of Paul's overall view of God.

implicitly contrast "new" covenant with "old", even if the terminology of "new" and "old" is absent in Galatians?

(2) Children of the Two Covenants. Galatians 4,24.

In Galatians 4,21-5,1 Paul once more addresses the question of who the children of Abraham are, now with a focus on legitimacy.[107] It is thus significant that when διαθήκη occurs here, for the second time in Galatians, it is as δύο διαθῆκαι.[108] Paul explains this use of the Abraham tradition as "allegory".[109] Thus the two women, Sarah and Hagar, are identified in relation to Abraham by their status as free wife or slave woman and as mothers who gave birth to a free son and a slave son, respectively.[110] By alluding to Gen

---

[107] The Abraham tradition as used in 4,21-5,1 is taken by some to be out of place, its content being related to 3,6-4,7. Thus Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.147; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.216, and Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.69, following Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.319, who points to the interpretation as midrashic and from a pre-pauline tradition.
Others see the pericope related to 4,20, linking a personal and a biblical appeal, as C. K. Barrett, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.1-16, esp. p.8. Cf. Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.316-17, who links the issue of law-promise to freedom; similarly Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.30.

[108] As with 3,15.17 there is a disagreement over whether to translate διαθήκη in 4,24 as "will" or "covenant"; but since the legal context is less obvious here, I refer to the various commentaries for further details.

[109] The difficult question whether Paul operates with an allegorical, typological or mixed metaphor of interpretation need not be considered here.
1. For a typological interpretation, see Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.147-48, who takes Isaac and Ishmael as types for the true descendants of Abraham, for the Christians, respectively, the unfaithful Israel.
2. F.F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 1982, p.217-18 sees typology as an interpretation where "an aspect of the new covenant is presented in terms of an Old Testament narrative" thus presupposing an understanding of history as salvation history.
3. For an allegorical interpretation, see Herman N. Ridderbos, 1976, p.175-76; Donald Guthrie, *Galatians*, 1981, p.123; or Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.134.
4. Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.253-7 and Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift*, 1986, p.204-11, distinguish between "speak allegorically" and "interpret allegorically", and both prefer "speak" to "interpret".
5. Most scholars prefer to talk about a mixture of typology and allegory. Thus, J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 1910, p.180; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.30; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.239; Friedrich Lang, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.314; Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.72; Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.320-21; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.219; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.320, note 20; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.57; Gijs Bouwman, *ANRW* II 25,4, 1987, p.3144; Leonard Goppelt, *Typos*, 1969, p.167-68.

[110] J. Louis Martyn, in *Faith*, 1991, p.174-84, has pointed to Paul's use of γεννάω as a term for his missionary activity, cf. 1 Cor 4,14-15, Philem 10; he further takes the present ptc. in 4,24 as evidence for a concurrent missionary work of Paul's opponents ("Teachers"), and suggests that Paul refers to the birth process of two types of churches.
From the point of view of identity, they are both contemporary communities.

16,15 and 21,2-10 (but not 17) Paul is probably trying to bring his readers to understand the implications of how a return to the law will affect the life and belief of the community. The contrast between two covenants is suggested by the two women as examples of two ways of relating to Abraham, rather than by the Genesis tradition.[111] I shall here point to the consequences for self-understanding.

Possibly provoked by the problem of circumcision, Paul interprets the Genesis story contrasting the "child of flesh" to the "child of promise" (v.23).[112] By doing this he opposes two concepts, slavery and freedom. He is then led to conclude that the two mutually exclude each other. The point is that although both children of Abraham could claim descent (v.22) only one has the true status of a legitimate child. The issue is clearly, as in Gal 3, related to identity, but unlike there, the reinterpretation of the Abraham tradition is not the nature of inheritance but legitimacy. The question here is, Who are the true children?

A straightforward reading of the Genesis story would be to understand Isaac, son of Sarah, as the true heir of Abraham; because Isaac is the fulfilment of the promise, his descendants are heirs to the Sinai covenant, while Ishmael, son of Hagar, to whom a different promise is given (Gen 16,10), is not a true heir. However, Paul turns this on its head.[113] Because he again reads scripture christologically, he interprets the story differently. Therefore, he can arrive at an interpretation that takes Hagar as a representative of the Sinai covenant which then is interpreted as a covenant of slavery. By drawing a parallel between the slave woman and the slavery of the law, he prepares for the comparison of slavery to the present Jerusalem, by assigning one group to the category of slaves with no right to the promise to Abraham. Simultaneously, Paul has identified another group as free, as children of Sarah, having Jerusalem above as their mother. What is the purpose of this?

The comparison clearly ends in an antithetical statement that can be inter-

---

[111] This has been observed also by J. Louis Martyn, Ibid., p.187, pointing to the absurdity of Paul's standpoint: "He (Paul) speaks of *two* covenants in order to establish the integrity of God's *one* church". (Author's italic.)

[112] With 5,3-6 as background, the issue is perhaps the practice of the law of circumcision, which, Paul argues, calls for the whole law to be observed. However, the return to the law is most likely not yet a reality, cf. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.216; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.241; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.317 and Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.252 who refers to the phrase: θέλοντες εἶναι.

[113] C. K. Barrett, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.10-11, suggests Paul responds to the opponents' literal interpretation.

preted in two ways. Either the contrast is an antithesis of two linear covenants, one covenant succeeding another; or the contrast refers to two covenant principles, freedom and slavery, in which case the two different identities are timeless.

In the first case, the contrast may be interpreted in terms of temporal replacement, that is the Sinai covenant, a covenant with ethnic Israel being superseded by a superior and later covenant, the covenant equated with the church.[114] Since this linearity contains both the idea of covenant replacement or supersession, validity and superiority are clearly implied. Although this is a possible interpretation, that is if historical development is presupposed, I shall reject it and opt for the second possibility arguing in (a) that the antithetical character of the arguments suggests two different qualities, rather than linear covenants.[115] In (b) I shall demonstrate how the difference in quality relates to different ecclesiological identities.

(a) Covenant of Freedom and Slavery. When Paul in 4,21-5,1 operates with an antithesis of two women, the question is, What exactly does he refer to when he speaks in those terms? Although Paul uses a comparison of two, the expressions are not parallel in all their parts.[116] On one side there is a clear identification of Hagar with slavery, the Sinai covenant, law, and present enslaved Jerusalem.[117] One implication of this is that physical descent, covenantal law and present cult are rejected. Another is that any

---

[114] There is a long tradition from church fathers to modern scholarship for this identification. See J. Louis Martyn, in *Faith*, 1991, p.164-69.
As a typical example, I refer to Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.234: "The lines of tradition now literally "cross". The Hagar-Ishmael line, leading historically to the Arabs, now leads to the Jews; the Sarah-Isaac line, however,....leads to the Christians."

[115] Against Gräßer and Luz, I see the issue as more than an idea supporting the impossibility of the law in relation to salvation. See Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.69 and Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.319.

[116] Several scholars accept a parallel structure, so that, by implication Sarah, the free is identified to the (new) covenant. Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.32; Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.148; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.245; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.57; Friedrich Lang, *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.314; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.221. More cautious are Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.321 and Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.73.

[117] The complicated text critical problems have no impact on the interpretation that identifies Hagar and the Sinai covenant, I refer to the various commentaries, above all Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.219-21; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.322-24; Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.259-61; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.244-45. Cf. also Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift*, 1986, p.207-8; C.K. Barrett, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.12.

identity based on these values is rejected. On the other side the identification is less obvious. Not only is Sarah not mentioned by name, but referred to indirectly as mother of a son born in freedom, and by implication identified with the covenant promise. To complicate the matter, in the final part of the comparison Paul moves away from the metaphor and introduces another image, Jerusalem above, characterised as free.

Although Paul in Gal 4,21-5,1 demonstrates an appreciation of the covenant as a term for relationship with God, yet, a reevaluation takes place. On the one hand, he draws on the Old Testament covenant traditions and affirms these. On the other, he does not refer to the two covenants to argue for successive covenants, rather he sees them as both going back to Abraham. One he identifies with the principle of slavery through Hagar, the other he associates with the converse principle of freedom through Sarah. Identity is defined in terms of contrasts.

When Paul uses the contrast of κατὰ σάρκα to δι' ἐπαγγελιάς (v.23), this seems to serve the purpose of showing that the contrast between the two children derives from their mothers' respective status. Further, it serves to disregard all those who are κατὰ σάρκα, simply by reason of this not being δι' ἐπαγγελιάς; but because Paul does not specifically develop his metaphor to identify Sarah with the "new" covenant, the interest is not in "new" or "old" covenants.[118] The reason Paul does not operate with the idea of the "new" as opposed to or replacing the "old" covenant here, seems to be that he has no interest in covenant renewal. As for the idea of covenant fulfilment, this is less in the foreground than expected although it may be implied. Rather, Paul seems to imply both the point he has made in Gal 3, that the line of inheritance is through promise, and also that faith is more important than ethnic descent. This is expressed here in the language of adoption in 4,31: we are the children, not of the slave girl but of a free woman. Having thus identified the Galatian community, including himself, as the true children of God, Paul can answer the question regarding identity in a powerful way: true identity is primarily to have a child relationship with

---

[118] Not only is the qualification "new" and "old" absent; so too is the idea. For an unusual interpretation of the covenant as a new covenant see Bent Noack, in *Judendom*, 1986, p.242, who points to the succession of the covenants, although he takes the "new" back to Abraham which makes it in a way older than the "old". But, "new" is also a designation of content in relation to Christ in whom the covenant came into force.
See further, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes*, 1989, p.114, who identifies the two covenants as "the old covenant at Sinai and the older covenant with Abraham." Further, Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.77; esp. p.76: Because of the eschatological idea of fulfilment of promises in Christ, there is no renewal as in Jer 31.

God. By implication there is a contrast to a false identity.

Moreover, by operating not with historically successive covenants, but with two principles, Paul presupposes two simultaneously existing identities. Hence he must also argue for a distinction that has practical consequences. If humanity's relationship with God is constituted as a community this is visible in mutual love and it builds on inclusiveness as ideal. However, because the community is submitted to the same conditions as Jesus, to suffering, cross and death (6,14), actuality contradicts the ideal. Since Christians face the same conditions and the prospect of persecution, identity is defined in this light, the community is forced to exclude: in practical terms, the exclusion of those who build on any opposed idea of identity. Thus, when Paul uses "two covenants" here, identifying one covenant with freedom and the other with slavery, the two stand not only for two different categories of relationship, vertical and horizontal, but also for two different horizontal relationships, two identities built on opposed principles.

Instead of linear covenants and a replacement idea, the two covenants stand for opposed modes of existence. Thus Paul cuts a dividing line across all historically based communities, "Israel" as well as "church". By distinguishing between those who by God's adoption are true children and those who are not, and by referring to true and false as existential categories of relationship with God, he defines identity as true God-relationship within existing communities but not necessarily between them. When Paul operates with timeless principles, with an antithesis of freedom and slavery, a different view of covenant emerges.[119]

Since the dialectical language sets the covenants in an antithesis, two principles are opposed. Hence Paul's principal interest concentrates on the dissociation from slavery which then helps to explain his lack of interest in a positive interpretation of the covenant promise here. The reason for this lack of interest is not clear. It might be grounded in the opponents' different ideas of what covenant means. However, it is not clear in this context whether or not they identify covenant with law, or perhaps adhere to

---

[119] Cf. Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.320-21, who rightly points to this antithesis. However I question his interpretation that this concerns new and old covenant.
Gijs Bouwman, *ANRW* II 25,4, 1987, p.3151, interprets two "Existenzweisen... die synchron nebeneinander bestehen, und seit Abraham immer bestanden haben".
This is also how I understand Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.133, who sees the antithesis to be between two "Gemeinschaften" or "Nachkommenschaften", although it may be understood differently.

a covenant replaced in time, and I shall not engage in a speculation on this matter.

(b) Identity of the Covenant Mothers. Above I suggested that because the antithesis of freedom and slavery is understood as an antithesis of principles, exclusion becomes an issue. This is the case when Paul quotes Isa 54,1 as a support and a proof-text for the argument of who the true children are, since the quotation then functions to identify who the false children are. The question is, How does it provide a rationale for exclusion?

The answer lies in the metaphor in 4,25-26, especially in the contrast of the present Jerusalem to the Jerusalem above.[120] It is worth noting that Paul, by using the imagery of mothers, draws not only on the Old Testament, but also on a rich symbolism in Greek culture.[121] At the same time, there seems to be no covenant idea beneath the Jerusalem imagery in Gal 4,26.[122] Even so, it affects identity. How?

Paul uses Isa 54,1 as an eschatological prophecy which he also applies to the existing community.[123] It is impossible to establish precisely the

---

[120] The contrast of *νῦν* to *ἄνω* is a mixture of two images, and therefore not a simple contrast. Cf. Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.263: "Either the Jerusalem that now is, and the Jerusalem that is to be, or the Jerusalem on earth and the Jerusalem above."
The expression "Jerusalem above" builds on a Jewish apocalyptic idea, see above all Isa 54,11-12; Tob 13,9-18. Jub 4,26; SyrBar 4,1-6; 4 Ezra 7,26. Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.32-33; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.221-5; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.325-6. For the dualistic change of era in gnostic parallels see Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, p.223-5 or Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.247 who sees a gnostic dualism mixed with Jewish apocalyptic ideas.
Some take the antithesis as a platonic idea of a preexistent heavenly Jerusalem, the true and perfect city, cf. Gijs Bouwman, *ANRW* II 25,4, 1987, p.3152; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.33.

[121] Cf. Klaus Berger: "Im Hintergrund stehen unterschiedliche Vorstellungen: orientalische Stadtgöttinnen, die zugleich Mütter der Stadtkinder sind; die hellenistische Konzeption der Metropolis; die endzeitliche Gemeinde als Frau nach IV Ezr 9,38-10,56 und 1QH 3,7ff; die Polis als weibliche Figur nach Jes 54,1ff; Bar 4,9-5,9; Apk 2,26; I Pet 5,13; dazu auch II Joh 1 und die Beziehung der Vaterstadt als Herrin in der Inschrift aus Gerasa nach AuC 5 (1936) 214f sowie der Titel '*domina mater ecclesia*' nach Tertullian, Mart 1,1." Cf. *TRE* 18, 1988, p.209.

[122] Unless Jerusalem is taken as a symbol of Israel's election and seen as a cosmic reality, as in Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 1985, p.101.137.

[123] Cf. Sigfred Pedersen, in *Skriftsyn*, 1989, p.40-41. Thus he points to the methodological use of Isa 54,1 as foundation for an ecclesiological argument in Gal 4, answering the question, who are the heirs? As parallel he mentions the use of Ps 32,1-2 as a soteriological foundation in Rom 4,7-8, answering a different question of how one claims inheritance.
C. K. Barrett, *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.12, reads the quotation as prophecy

tradition on which Paul draws, but two things are significant: twice Jerusalem is called mother, capable of bearing children; Jerusalem above is both our mother and symbol of freedom. Therefore Paul can conclude: "we are children of the free woman" (4,31).[124] The key to the understanding of this quotation lies in Paul's ecclesiology.

When Paul gives scriptural proof by relating *σπεῖρα* from Isa 54,1 (v.27) to Sarah, who in the Genesis story is both barren, yet mother to Isaac, he bases ecclesiology on a prophetic foundation. This is clear from his statement: You are children of the promise, like Isaac was (v.28). When "children of promise" is read as an identity category, it refers to a church on its way to becoming a multitude. Both the expressions "numerous children", *πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα*, and "more children than", *μᾶλλον ἤ*, (v.27) as well as the use of *ἐστέ* and *ἐσμέν* (v.28.31), suggest that the prophecy concerns the church's present situation.[125]

By using Jerusalem imagery in an ecclesiological context, the prophecy defines the Galatian community as free, having derived its status from Jerusalem above. It is worth noting that Paul uses apocalyptic imagery, and that he thus presupposes eschatological fulfilment. However, it is equally remarkable that he does not identify the community with Jerusalem above.[126] Since Paul's eschatology contains tension between an already and a not yet, this raises the question whether his ecclesiology here contains the same tension.[127] If belonging is understood as belonging to the eschatological people, identity derives its content and quality from the future, from a hope for freedom, rather than from the past. In that case the prophecy can function as a promise to the elect that implies a rejection of the non-

---

of a future for the church of sinners, hence with focus on soteriology.

[124] Cf. Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift*, 1986, p.209: "Mit Hilfe dieses Zitats begründet Paulus aber nicht nur die implizit vorgenommene Gleichzetzung von Sara und der *ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ*, sondern auch die Aussage, dass sie *μήτηρ ἡμων* ist."

[125] Cf. Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.73-74 following Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.57. See also Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.249; Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.328.

[126] Cf. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.248 and Walter Klaiber, *Rechtfertigung*, 1982, p.164; but against Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.73, Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.223.
Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.326, warns against an identification of church and Jerusalem above, and points to a relation to christology, then concludes p.327: "'Das obere Jerusalem' ist also für Paulus die Welt des Auferstandenen und Erhöhten, von der das eschatologische Heil für die Gläubigen seinen Ursprung hat."

[127] Cf. Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.235; Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.73; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.57.

elect. Salvation is at stake. If belonging is understood as social belonging, group identity derives its content from the past promise and its quality from present status as well as from a principle of freedom. In that case the prophecy can serve as the rationale for exclusion (v.29) of those with a different self-understanding.[128] Exclusion is a matter of discipline, has no bearing on salvation. How does Paul arrive at this conclusion?

When exclusion is defined as exclusion of all those who have status as slaves, be it to στοιχεῖα (4,9), to νομός (4,21), or subject to observation of "special days, and months, and seasons, and years" (4,10), or to the demand to practice circumcision (5,2),[129] the emphasis has changed. Exclusion is not on the level of ethnic Jews being rejected for not being in a covenant relationship; the concern is with the principle of slavery.

What then is the significance of the present Jerusalem being identified with slavery (4,25)? It seems that by doing this Paul explicitly attacks Jerusalem, both as a place and a symbol of identity. One possibility is that he challenges the whole tradition which interprets Zion/Jerusalem as holy, which sees Jerusalem as the image of heaven on earth, and acknowledges the visible locus of the divine presence in temple, city and land.[130] If Paul attacks this tradition, he attacks Jewish identity from within, parallel to the criticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[131] If this is the background, Paul calls for reform, especially when he attacks the temple in its identity status.[132] Another possibility is that Paul may, as a Christian with a different identity, challenge the establishment and authority of Jerusalem as the representative of a different ecclesiological identity. If this is

---

[128] Cf. C.K. Barrett's interpretation, in *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.13. Because of a persecution Paul concludes that there is also a call to exclusion. Thus v.30 gives a proof for v.29. Cf. Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.235.

[129] Note the *casus eventualis*, meaning circumcision is an option.

[130] See for instance Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism*, 1990, p.97-107. The idea of the temple as image of heaven is based on apocalyptic ideas, cf. Test Levi 2-5. However, in that case the idea functions as giving an authority to the priesthood; hence differently. See also his article in *In the Shelter*, 1984, p.199-215.
An alternative is Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 1985, p.137-142, who interprets heavenly temple in terms of antitype of an ultimate reality and not in terms of localization.

[131] Typical of this view is Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.246.
What Paul attacks is the strand of Judaism which sees the present Jerusalem as representative for the institutional authority of the Jewish people, thus as a symbol for national and religious unity.

[132] For a New Testament parallel, see e.g. Acts 7,1-53, esp. v.48; and for Dead Sea Scrolls, see e.g. 1QS 8,10-16.
For a recent treatment of the temple as symbol of identity, see James D.G. Dunn, *The Partings*, 1991, p.37-97.

the case, he criticises from outside. The attack is on the priesthood in particular, since it serves as a symbol of false authority, false interpretation, and of slavery to the law.[133] Judaism is then criticised for setting spatial limits to the presence of God. If this is the case, Paul uses heavy polemical and exclusive language from the point of view of a different self-understanding. It is also conceivable that Paul attacks a Christian identity from within by challenging Jerusalem as representative of the authority of a Christian community; hence he challenges the idea that Jerusalem has a superior status or is the locus of origin of the church.[134] At issue then is a falsely based Christian identity contrasted with Paul's true identity. This further means that Paul uses the contrast between present Jerusalem and Jerusalem above to define true Christian identity as opposed to a false church. Whatever Paul is challenging, the point is that Jerusalem above stands for the only possible symbol of freedom, for both Jews and Christian believers. Since Jerusalem above serves as a symbol of inclusion, because its freedom is centered in Christ, and because freedom is the unifying force for identity, the present Jerusalem becomes a symbol of exclusiveness.[135] From the perspective that the Jerusalem above is an eschatological symbol of freedom Paul must conclude that the present Jerusalem is a symbol of slavery.

In sum, Paul replaces Jerusalem as a symbol of slavery with the only possible symbol, Christ (cf. 3,28). Freedom is at stake. This Paul bases christologically, even when it has an eschatological dimension, (cf. Col 3,1-4; Phil 3,20-1); therefore quality is also at stake. Anyone subject to the status of slavery must be rejected, because slavery builds not only on a different principle, but also on an opposed idea, on falseness. Those who adhere to this principle must be excluded from the community of those who believe in Christ, if its status as true church is to be retained. In the context of Galatians 4, it cannot be an issue of Jews against Gentiles, since Paul argues for legitimate status, not for ethnic inheritance. Faith, not covenant, thus becomes the exclusive basis of identity.[136] This then defines identity as an issue of internal boundaries of exclusion, and

---

[133] A typical example is Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.261-62.

[134] Cf. Franz Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.325, who believes that the Jewish Christian's centre in Jerusalem was in mind. Further, J. Louis Martyn, in *Faith*, 1991, p.183-4, who identifies the Jerusalem church with a law-observant mission to Gentiles.

[135] Cf. T. David Gordon, *Interpr* 41, 1987, p.42, who sees the Torah as an inadequate symbol for identity, because it excludes Gentiles to whom the promise is (also) given, thus the present Jerusalem becomes a symbol of exclusiveness.

[136] Cf. the child-terminology, in 3,7.26.29; 4,5.6.7. See (1) above.

covenant as a vertical relationship with God.

Conclusion to Galatians. Basically Paul uses covenant in Gal 3-4 in the Old Testament meaning of covenant as relationship with God. This is the case when he argues for validity, especially clear in the context, in Gal 3, of covenant promise fulfilled. By interpreting the presence of the Spirit as a mark of covenant relationship, he emphasises covenant as promise. By answering the question, who qualify as children of Abraham, ecclesiological identity is redefined as based on faith. From the contrast of freedom to slavery, but not the contrast of old and new covenant, identity is defined as continuing the line of freedom, not the line of flesh (in Gal 4). Although identity builds on the past, this is important only in its christological interpretation, meaning there is no interest in covenant replacement. By pointing to evidence that the Galatians possess the Spirit, Paul identifies the community as being children of God. Moreover, those who are legitimate children have rights as heirs to the covenant promises. Ultimately, this means that Paul has reinterpreted and widened covenant identity, from identity based on ethnic criteria to it being based in creation. Further, when Paul reads the Old Testament prophecy ecclesiologically, his reinterpretation of identity forces him to argue for exclusion. The community consists of those who believe in Christ, who act out their faith according to the law of love and freedom, and who face persecution from outside as identification with Christ's suffering. Therefore it becomes necessary to establish a dividing line between freedom and slavery, and also to act out true identity in practical opposition to a false identity. Moreover, as in Romans, because identity is redefined according to different criteria, covenant in its narrow sense, that is in its association with law, is no longer an obvious term for the present community's relationship with God. Rather, Paul prefers the expression, children of God, and thus both widens the ethno-centric to a universal relationship, and narrows it to a christo-centric faith relationship. Boundaries therefore need to be defined accordingly, as we shall see in the next chapter.

IV. From New to Old Covenant in 2 Corinthians.

The last of the Pauline texts I shall look at is 2 Corinthians 3, in which διαθήκη occurs twice, in 3,6.14. In both cases διαθήκη is in the singular: qualified with καινός in 3,6, and παλαιός in 3,14. These qualifications of the covenant are not used elsewhere in the Pauline literature, except for "new" in the pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Cor 11,25. This then is the first issue of concern.

Another concern is Paul's use of contrast terms. Even if Paul argues along

the same lines as other writers of his Jewish background, there are reasons to believe that he makes a conscious choice of terminology in his use of dualistic terms.[137] So from my point of view of identity it is important to be aware whether or not the elaborate contrast statements have a bearing on ecclesiological definitions or not.

Finally, Paul's use of covenant tradition needs our attention. Thus, it is significant that there is no attempt in 2 Corinthians to draw on the Abraham tradition as in Galatians. And unlike Romans there is no attempt to ensure the validity of the covenant for Israel. Instead Paul alludes to the prophetic traditions from Ezekiel and/or Jeremiah, and interprets the aspect of renewal of the Exodus covenant.[138] This may simply indicate that the problem is not the same in all the communities to which Paul writes, or it may reflect the fact that just as the background material can operate with more than one covenant aspect, so can Paul.

By analysing 2 Corinthians 3 from this perspective I shall ask, What purpose do the qualifications "new" and "old" serve in relation to the covenant? And in relation to this, What validity does covenant have in its aspect as "old"? Or in its aspect as "new"? What does the *γράμμα-πνεῦμα* contrast mean? How is this related to identity in general? To "new" and "old" in particular? What is Paul's concern when drawing on "glory" from Exodus 34? Finally, Is Paul concerned with present self-understanding in terms of ethnocentricity as opposed to universality? Alternatively expressed, Is the ecclesiological identity widened or narrowed in comparison to the Jewish background?

It is of note that *διαθήκη* occurs in a passage that is part of the wider context of 2,14-7,4, in which Paul is engaged in a defence of apostleship in

---

[137] The use of contrast terms is a traditional Jewish way of arguing antithetically. Thus, the idea of two spirits, of light and darkness, in 1QS 3,19-26, serves as a designation of those inside and outside the community. Further evidence from a Jewish background is the teaching of the two ways in e.g. T.Ash 1,3-9, cf. T.Naph 2 and T.Ben 6. Or the distinction between spirit of truth and spirit of error, cf. T.Jud 20, with the aspect that both truth and error are written on the heart, known by God.
For evidence from rabbinical texts, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.71.
Contrasts are known elsewhere in a Pauline context of preaching, e.g. 2 Cor 2,15-16, where the sacrificial images, *εὐοδία* and *ὀσμή*, are used of effect of Paul's proclamation, causing life for some, death for others. Or, the contrast between wisdom and foolishness in 1 Cor 1,18 as part of Paul's message of the cross. In neither case are the contrasts designations for the community.

[138] For the renewal aspect of Exodus 33-34, see Chapter One II (1) (c).

general, and of his apostolic authority and status in particular.[139] In the narrower context of 3,1-4,6[140] Paul deals with his ministry, contrasted to that of Moses.[141] Here Paul's interpretation of the Old Testament both carries a special message and presupposes a common tradition on which he and his readers build. From this perspective the key question is whether the "new" covenant is a replacement of the old in terms of having a different function, or "new" means renewal in terms of restoration, fulfilment, reinforcement, or reestablishment of the original value and function.

A brief discussion of the purpose of 2 Corinthians is needed by way of introduction. First, Paul is engaged in self-defence, introduced in 2,14-17 as an issue over "letters of recommendation".[142] If there has been an attack on Paul's authority this would explain the polemical tone, his use of contrast language, the dualistic argument, and also that his reasoning appears provocative, to the point of being condemnatory.[143] That defence is not in itself an attack, and despite the polemical tone, a positive train of thought on fundamental faith motifs is prevalent. This train runs through the whole of 3,1-4,6, ranging from a definition of ministry and of community, to the exegesis of Moses' encounter with God, to the character of glory, and to the significance of the veil.[144] Secondly, Paul defends his

---

[139] For this I refer to the recent commentaries of C.K. Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 1979, p.135; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.55-56; and Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.51.
If the overall defence is ministry it matters less, whether the disagreement is over credentials, as suggested by Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 1984, p.53, or more generally over Paul's apostolic status, cf. H. Ulonska, *EvTh* 26, 1966, p.378-88, esp. 383, or a misinterpretation of the Old Testament. It probably has more than one cause.

[140] The structure of this passage is either a cyclic structure: A: 2,14-3,6; B: 3,7-18; A^1: 4,1-6 (see, Jan Lambrecht, *Bib* 64, 1983, p.344-80) or there is a progressive line of thought (see e.g. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *TS* 42, 1981, p.630-44).

[141] In agreement with several scholars, thus Johannes Munck, *Paul*, 1959, p.58; Morna D. Hooker, *NTS* 27, 1981, p.295-309, esp.297; Ernst Bammel, *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 54, 1983, p.400.
Against Philipp Vielhauer, In *Oikodome*, Bd 2. 1979, p.212, for whom the contrast is between Moses and Christ; N.T. Wright, in *The Climax*, 1991, p.180, who takes the contrast as one between Christians and the Israelites, following Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.93-94; C.J.A. Hickling, *NTS* 21, 1974, who thinks Moses is opposed to Christians.

[142] The problem of letters of recommendation, whether official or personal, or perhaps "heavenly" letters, is less relevant, but see commentaries on this matter.

[143] Cf. Wayne A. Meeks: "When dualistic language appears, it invariably implies a negative view of the outside society, even in places where the immediate function of the dualism is to reinforce the internal ordering of the group." In *Critical History*, 1979, p.4-29, esp. p.9.

[144] It is not just an argument which begins with a triviality over recommen-

apostolic authority as God-given (cf. 2,16; 3,6) by referring to who the community is; and who God is (cf. 3,4.6; 4,6) by appealing to scripture in general. He clearly assumes the authority of the Old Testament, otherwise the included interpretation would be difficult to maintain. From the point of view of identity, Paul's use of scripture serves the purpose of creating a consensus on past identity, that is tradition as contained in scripture within the Corinthian community. The reference to the Sinai event functions primarily to shape identity from the past. The particular midrashic[145] argument in 3,7-18 should be seen as an attempt at reinterpreting Christian identity, as we shall see.

Thirdly, whether or not Paul is provoked by internal or external opposition, it is clear that he is up against either individual/s or a group who take issue over his legitimacy.[146] It is quite possible that Paul's use of covenant

---

dation letters and moves into higher theological discussion, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *TS* 42, 1981, p.630-44, esp. p.634; C.J.A. Hickling, *NTS* 21, 1974, p.382.
Rather, I see the whole passage as a carefully composed interpretation aimed at the Christian community, hence meaningful both where the question of Paul's authority and the question of identity of the community are at stake.

[145] First suggested by Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p.112, and now widely accepted, see e.g. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* II, 1949, p.111; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.58-60; Earl Richard, *RevBibl* 88, 1981, p.341-3; James D.G. Dunn, *JTS* 21, 1970, p.311; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *TS* 42, 1981, p.632, whose point on free association of ideas is very helpful.
Philipp Vielhauer, In *Oikodome*, Bd 2. 1979, p.196-228, prefers the expression typological exegesis, p. 210-11.
Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *JSNT* 9, 1980, p.2-28 argues for seeing the midrash in relation to the preexistence of Christ in the tabernacle.
Morna D. Hooker, *NTS* 27, 1981, understands the Pauline exegesis to have the purpose to explain Exodus in terms of its fulfilment in Christ, p.297, and the aim to create a contrast between two types of glory, of which one is derivative, the other direct, cf. p.301. As a result Paul's contrast of two types of ministry ends in a contrast between Israel and Christians.
Ernst Bammel, *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 54, 1983, has the important observation that the midrash is not only on Exod 33-34 but also on Num 12,7, see p.400.

[146] Several studies on opponents and their supposed influence on Paul's argument exist. For an overview and a discussion see Jerry L. Sumney, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 1990, p.13-73.
The suggestions to their identity fall into four categories:
1. The majority of scholars identify them as Judaizers, adherents to keeping the law. See e.g. C.K. Barrett, *NTS* 17, 1970-71, p.233-54; P. W. Barnett, *JSNT* 22, 1984, p.3-17.
2. A popular view is that they were Hellenistic-Jewish propagandist, or itinerant preachers. See e.g. Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents*, 1987; Gerhard Friedrich, In *Abraham unser Vater*, 1963, p.181-215.
3. A minority view is held by Ernst Käsemann, choosing to see them as "pneumatics", *ZNW* 41, 1942, p.33-71. Jerry L. Sumney offers a variant of this, seeing the Spirit as the point of disagreement.
4. Another minority view is that they were gnostics advocated by Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 1971.
For the view that there were two groups, Judaizers and "pneumatics", and

terminology reflects a situation in which the covenant or questions of "old" or "new" were forced on him by opponents' use of one or both terms. It is not possible, however, to know exactly what vocabulary the opponents used, or what their interpretation of newness was.[147] So, we cannot be certain whether they appealed to the "old" covenant as eternal, interpreted "new" as having an obligatory aspect, appealed to the law as the content of God's covenant at Sinai, or alluded to other Old Testament passages. Be that as it may, I shall focus here not on what the opponents meant by this term, but rather on covenant identity as defined by Paul in the qualifications "new" and "old", and ask, What theological reflections on church identity lie behind Paul's use of covenant terminology in 2 Cor 3?

(1) A New Covenant or a New Dimension?

One of the problems an interpreter is faced with in 2 Corinthians 3 is the tendency among scholars to view the covenant in terms of substitution, taking "old" as replaced with "new", Judaism as surpassed, and the Christian church as God's true covenant partner.[148] However, this particular type of reasoning is not very helpful. It is clear that Paul does not use "new" and "old" here in mutually exclusive, rather he uses "old" in 3,14 because he presupposes "new" in 3,6. The contrast developed is on ministry, while "new" and "old" are used differently. The basic question is, How does Paul use "covenant"? Then, What does Paul mean when he qualifies covenant as "new" and "old"? Does he in 2 Corinthians think of covenant replacement? Or in terms of covenant renewal?

Paul's use of covenant terminology in 2 Corinthians should be seen against the background of an Old Testament prophetic hope for renewal, expressed as

---

that Paul plays the two off against each other, see Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *ABR* 34, 1986, p.42-58 and *Theology*, 1991.

[147] Because the terminology, "new" and "old", is neither frequent in Paul's writing, nor a very characteristic feature, this could indicate that the vocabulary is forced on Paul. If this is the case, the question is, Did Paul use the same terms as the opponents, or use other ideas? Did he choose a particular text because it was suggested by the attack?

[148] Two classic examples would be Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.90-91; and A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.92: "Christianity is so superior to Judaism that it has extinguished it." More recently is e.g. Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.73: "From the lawgiver (Moses), Paul argues to that which he represents, viz., ancient Judaism whose glory, once historically a reality, is now fading away; indeed it is over, and its impermanence has given way to that which has come to stay, viz., the Gospel (v 10,11)."
Cf. also N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.180-1, when he takes the old covenant as annulled, especially p.181: the old covenant "was always *intended* to be a temporary mode of administration" (author's italic).

hope for a different quality of life.[149] Expecting a turning point within the framework of history, the prophets hoped for a return to the ideal, for a "new" relationship with God; exilic prophets hoped both for a return to the lost land and with it a lost identity, and for collective and individual renewal, such as expressed in the images "a law within the hearts" and "a new heart and a new spirit".[150] Similar hopes are found in the intertestamental writings, sometimes as a new existence within history, sometimes as new creation after an apocalyptic destruction has taken place.[151] Against the background of these hopes the question is whether or not Paul's reuse and reinterpretation of the heart imagery in 3,1-3 suggests that "new" has an eschatological value.[152] Moreover, if Paul's use of covenantal terminology is seen from the point of view of the hope for a future changed order, should not "new" be seen from the same perspective of change?

While Paul is primarily concerned with his own ministry in 3,1-4,6 he nevertheless employs covenant for that purpose of which διάκονοι καινῆς διαθήκης in 3,4-6 is proof.[153] The phrase is unique. Since it is qualified with both the problematic, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος, and the explanatory clause, τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῳοποιεῖ, renewal and spirit is at stake. Although these two qualifications are parallel statements on ministry,[154] they also raise the question, How is "new" covenant related to identity?

---

[149] See Chapter One, II (4) (b).

[150] Cf. the development from Jeremiah (31,33; 32,39-40) to Ezekiel (11,19; 36,26) suggested in Chapter One (4) (b).

[151] A renewal within history is found in Jubilees' hope that God will be present and dwell in a renewed Zion, cf. Jub 1,27-29, and that Israel shall rule the world, cf. Jub 32,19. See Chapter Two.
For an emphasis on destruction and judgment, see the War Scroll, e.g. 1QM 1,10- 12; 14,1-3.
An explicit hope for a new creation is found in 1QS 4,25: "For God has established the two spirits in equal measure until the determined end, and until the Renewal (ועשות חדשה)." See Chapter Four.

[152] Elsewhere Paul refers to "heart" as the place for the presence of the Spirit, given by God as a pledge of the presence of God (2 Cor 1,22, cf. 5,5; Gal 4,6), and he clearly has both the individual and the community and its relationship with God in mind (cf. "spirit of adoption", Rom 8,15).

[153] It is significant that Paul uses the first plural in the entire passage (2,14-7,4). This needs to be considered as not merely a stylistic reference to himself and the other apostles, but as language inclusive of the community.
Elsewhere Paul qualifies apostolic ministries in this way: θεοῦ διάκονοι (2 Cor 6,4), διάκονοι Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 11,23, cf. Col 1,7), the divine commission is also self-definition. When writing polemically, Paul can speak in a dualistic way also of ministers of Satan, 2 Cor 11,15.

[154] L.J. Koch, *Fortolkning*, 1958, p.177.

This passage is possibly Paul's answer to an attack on his authority as apostle, which is indicated by the emphatic use in 3,4 of πεποίθησις, confidence. What lies behind is possibly a personal attack on "weakness", as in 1 Cor 2,1-5. By stressing confidence through Christ, Paul clearly emphasises a particular sort of relationship, different in nature from the relationship of fear to which it is probably antagonistic.[155] With this and with the claim that his power is God-given, Paul's commission is described as not merely by human appointment (3,5).[156] It is noteworthy too, that the reference to the God-given authority of the ministry is carefully placed here as an introduction to Paul's interpretation of the Sinai event. The reason Paul introduces Moses is not clear, although the figure of Moses serves the purpose of being a figure either of comparison or of contrast.[157] If Paul's concern for the nature of ministry is expressed in the phrase, διάκονοι καινῆς διαθήκης, his ministry is also related to "new". The question is, What then does "new" stand for?

In ancient as well as in modern use "new" and "old" are opposite terms, but less clear are the values given to them: they may refer to temporally opposed terms, or to what is different in quality. The Greek language echoes this ambiguity.[158] Thus, "old" can have a negative value, stand for what is antiquated, out-of-date, out-of-fashion; or it can have a positive value of antique, venerable. "New" can be either fresh, modern, or untried, immature.[159] If we turn to the Old Testament Greek, we find that καινός does not simply have a temporal connotation, but can be used as a term for eschatological change, for the radical other.[160] While in the New Testament "new"

---

[155] See e.g. Exod 14,31. 20,18 for the fear among the people, but particularly 34,30. Cf. also Jer 32,39.
The same idea is found in Rom 8,15, fear set against adoption.

[156] This is an allusion to the calling of Moses in Exod 4, where Moses resists the call from God through excuses, including lack of power, ability to speak, and says, οὐχ ἱκανός εἰμι (LXX Exod 4,10). This allusion has been noted by Guy Wagner, *ETR* 60, 1985, p.58-59.

[157] Perhaps the comparison to Moses is caused by the circumstances in Corinth.

[158] The terms for "new" are νέος and καινός; for "old" ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός. For a word study of these two, I refer to Olof Linton, *SEA* 5, 1940, p.43-55. And for a study of newness, see R.A. Harrisville, *JBL* 74, 1955, p.69-79.

[159] Harrisville, Ibid., p.69-79, states that although there in classical Greek is a difference, this has disappeared in koine Greek. Νεός and καινός are synonymous, both are associated with temporal and qualitative values.
For newness he suggests it to be related to 1) contrast, 2) continuity, 3) dynamic and 4) finality.

[160] The Septuagint uses καινός as a translation for חדש, which has both a temporal and an eschatological aspect. The meaning of "modern" is implied in e.g. Judges 5,8, "new gods". But several cases of the eschatological connotation are found. Thus the καινή διαθήκη in Jer 31,31, or Deutero-Isaiah's idea of "new" in an eschatological connotation, for a divine intervention,

and "old" sometimes have temporal values, neither is confined to the temporal.[161] Since our modern society tends to place value on progress and evolution by associating "new" with what is better, because it is fresh, and "old" with the out-of-fashion that needs a replacement, it is necessary to be on guard against such a tendency when it appears in modern scholarship.[162] The values of "new" and "old" in the New Testament need to be seen in the perspective that "new" is not necessarily better than "old". And even if an attitude to old as out-of-date can be found, it must be stressed that the idea that "old" has a greater value, or is associated with the more original, is prominent in the ancient world.[163] The question in relation to Paul is, Does oldness refer to that which is past and in need of replacement, or of restoration to its original value. If Paul's use of "old" and "new" in 2 Corintians 3 is an issue of eschatological quality, how does he

---

an expectation of end time events in which God will create a new world, e.g. the ποιῶ καινά in Isa 42,9; 43,19; 48,6, the γῆ καινὴ in Isa 62,22; 65,17. Cf. the "new" of "Spirit" and "heart" in Ezek 11,19; 18,31; 36,26.

[161] For the ambivalence of καινός, in e.g. the use of "new" in the reference to clothing, cf. Mark 2,21; Luke 5,36, or the grave in Math 27,60 and John 19,41, see Olof Linton, *SEA* 5, 1940, p.43-55.
The eschatological connotation is found not only in the quotation from Jer 31,31 in Hebr 8,8; cf. 9,15, but also in relation to the last supper in Mark 14,25 and parallels; the "new earth" and "new heaven" in Rev 21,1; the "new Jerusalem" in Rev 3,12; cf. also the καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα in Rev 21,5.
Paul uses καινός in 2 Cor 5,17, in which a theology of new creation is explicit: ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις. 5,17 cannot be a reference to individual existence, mainly because of the allusion to Isa 43,18-19 as a fulfilled prophecy with a collective, eschatological aspect, as argued by G.K. Beale, *NTS* 35, 1989, esp. p.558-9.
In 3,18 newness is related to the idea of transformation into the image of Jesus (cf. 1,22). Cf. Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 1960, p.187; Gal 6,15 and "new humanity" in Eph 2,15 and 4,24 undoubtedly belongs in this category too.
For the collective aspect see also 2 Cor 5,14; cf.3,17-18 and 4,13-14.

[162] See e.g. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* II, 1949, p.113, who goes as far as to suggest that because δόξα was transitory, the Old Testament was transitory, meant to be annihilated in Christ. More recently, Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.73.
While Ulrich Luz sees the two covenants in antithesis, the contrast is not simply one of time. One aspect is that of past is over against present, *EvTh* 27, 1967, therefore he can state, p.325: "Γράμμα ist das Alte, Abgetane (Röm. 7,5; 2 Kor. 3,14), die Vergangenheit (vgl. Röm. 7,5; 2 Kor. 3,7), πνεῦμα das Neue (Röm. 7,6; 2 Kor. 3,6), die Gegenwart (νυνὶ δέ Röm. 7,6), die Zukunft (2 Kor. 3,8)". Another aspect is related to eschatology, which means he can maintain, p.327: "Vom neuen Bund her wird das Alte Testament "enthüllt" (V. 14ff.)". Similarly, Ekkehard Stegemann, *EvTh* 37, 1977, p.514: "Erst das Neue macht das Vorhergehende zum Alten".
The most recent attempt at associating old with the need of replacement is N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.178: "The old covenant was destined to be abolished; the new is destined to remain".

[163] Thus Norbert Lohfink, *Bund*, 1989, p.54: "Man gab doch meist dem Alten zunächts einmal die Chance der größeren Originalität und Unabgenutzheit. Das neuere war das Verbrauchte, das Degenerierte, das Epigonische."

define this?

It is clear that Paul does not contrast "new" covenant with "old", let alone new covenant people with old.[164] And while Paul's reference to "new" does not necessarily imply replacement, his interpretation of it shows, as we shall see, that he has an eschatological renewal in mind. Paul defines "new" in terms of its quality, hence not from the past, but from the eschaton. If Paul in Romans can affirm the validity of God's covenant by drawing on the aspect of eschatological, christological forgiveness, and interpret the Abrahamic covenant as fulfilled in Christ, "new" and "old" in 2 Corinthians should be read as another attempt at using the covenant affirmatively. So, contrary to an overwhelming consensus, I suggest that "old" be taken as a positive term.[165] If the passage is read in this way the most obvious reading would be to suggest that Paul not only accepts the Sinai tradition as a prophecy that points beyond the actual historical event, but also that he values this as the epitome of a genuine relationship with God. However, by interpreting the story as such Paul simultaneously reinterprets covenant from a different perspective. Here lies the core of a disagreement over both the nature of ministry and the quality of the covenant. Positively, the Sinai-story functions as a reminder to Israel of its identity, its having been constituted as a people held together by a common law and a common belief in the presence of God, including a belief in God's love and forgiveness when the covenant is broken (cf. Exod 34,6-7). Negatively, it functions as a rationale for exclusion of other peoples from a covenant relationship with the God of Israel (cf. Exod 34,10-16). Hence covenant becomes associated with national unity as well as with separation from other nations. Therefore, when Paul focuses on the presence of God's glory in the Sinai-event, he changes the perspective: Moses' glorification testifies to the validity of the encounter with God in the past. As such it stands as a foundation or a model for a covenant relationship; but if the covenant

---

[164] In agreement with e.g. Ernst Bammel, *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 54, 1983, p.399 and Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.60.
Against Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.325; Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.81; Philipp Vielhauer, In *Oikodome*, Bd 2. 1979, p.213.
For the contrast of covenant peoples, see Morna D. Hooker, *NTS* 27, 1981, p.301; N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.180.

[165] The majority of scholars fail to read "old" in positive terms, as a look at a selection of commentaries will show. Thus, Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p.121; A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.85.100; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 1984, p.233-4; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.69; and Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.73. One of the most cautious is C.K. Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 1979, p.121, where he concludes that new covenant has its quality from righteousness and the Spirit. "This carries with it the abolition of the law (in the old, legalistic, sense).

relationship builds on the law as its leading principle, or is limited to ethnic Israel, covenant becomes ethno-centric: not invalid, but too narrow, leaving aside the potential for a universal relationship.

This interpretation is supported by the use of καινὴ κτίσις in 2 Cor 5,17: "So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away, everything has become new." The visible presence of the Spirit both represents eschatological renewal or life and marks ecclesiological identity and has its counterpart in death.[166] For Paul "new" fundamentally takes its quality from a theology of creation, as supported by 4,6.[167] Therefore when covenant is qualified as "new" or "old" these terms cannot refer to historical covenant establishments only, nor do they divide between two covenant peoples. If that were the case, covenant is in danger of loosing its universality when one covenant replaces another in time or history. Why, then, does Paul refer to the ethno-centric Sinai covenant?

When my point is taken, that Paul's interpretation of "new" is tied to his theology of creation, the Sinai covenant serves as a positive reminder to those who may be identified as being "in Christ" (2 Cor 5,19; Rom 8,1-3) for the central motif that runs through the Sinai event is that covenant guarantees the presence of God.[168] This means a new dimension to the Sinai covenant has been added. When the Sinai encounter with God is read christologically, the presence of God is encountered in Christ (cf. 3,18; 4,6). Consequently the covenant aspect of newness and oldness must be interpreted accordingly. If "new" is merely replacement in time, the validity of the past tradition for present identity is at stake. If "new" is limited to temporal replacement, its potential for radical newness is almost lost.[169] Thus I conclude that when Paul qualifies ministry with references to a "new" covenant and to the Spirit, this suggests eschatological renewal rather than

---

[166] The Spirit is God's guarantee of the new relationship, cf. 2 Cor 1,22; 5,5; Rom 8,16.23; Gal 3,1-3.
Below I shall return to the life-death contrast.

[167] That 4,6 alludes to Gen 1,3 (influenced also by Isa 9,2), the creation of light on the first day of creation introducing the process of creation, is generally accepted. See e.g. Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p.139; L. J. Koch, *Fortolkning*, 1958, p.16; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 1984, p.223-4.
Jacob Jervell, Ibid., p.195-96, stresses that 4,6 is an eschatological interpretation of Gen 1, meaning that creation of light of knowledge in hearts is a recreation of the human in the image of God.

[168] See, Ekkehard Stegemann, *ThZ* 42, 1986, p.107. Recently the same idea has been expressed also by Scott J. Hafemann, *HBT* 14, 1992, p.36.

[169] The clearest example of this standpoint is A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.85.

temporal replacement.

In short, "new" is that which brings the potential of the "old" into existence by adding a new christological and pneumatological dimension. With the sameness of God maintained, revelation remains valid, but the dynamic of God makes change possible.[170] By employing a christological, eschatological interpretation of the event, the Sinai covenant is used to point to the importance of an encounter with the presence of God.[171] But if the Sinai story is read without the christological key, its real meaning remains hidden, its potential for inclusiveness never comes to fruition and it may be reduced to a death relationship that has no value.

(2) Power of Death and Life.

In 2 Corinthians 3,6 Paul defines the two ministries respectively as one of γράμμα over against one of πνεῦμα. This distinction cannot refer to a contrast of old covenant to new, for two reasons. First Paul does not use the word "old" in v.6, which means there is no immediate contrast in this verse to "new".[172] Secondly, Paul immediately moves on to differentiate two types of δόξα in the midrash on Exodus 34 in 3,7-18 in which he emphasises the effects of the divine power. The question is, Does Paul, when concentrating on ministry in the contrast ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως and ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, in 3,9, refer to ministry on the more abstract level of principles or does he rather distinguish between two different qualities of one covenant, the "new" covenant?

In line with Paul's use of contrasts in Galatians, I suggest the distinction here is one of principle. This interpretation builds on my conclusion above, that "new" refers to eschatological renewal rather than replacement. This interpretation is supported by the context, from the fact that Paul now relates πνεῦμα to life and γράμμα to death, thus creates an existential

---

[170] Dynamic can mean a power to transcend time, to bring the old into existence. Or with Norbert Lohfink, *Bund*, 1989, p.54: "dieses Neue bringt aufs neue das Uralt ans Licht".

[171] R.A. Harrisville, *JBL*, 74, 1955, p.75, points to the element of *dynamic* as the most outstanding feature of newness. The dynamic power is always related to Christ "who brings it, i.e., has received power to execute the unfolding of God's purpose in the end of time". I question his point, p.75-76, "It (power) is also revealed in the power of the new to perpetuate itself, in contrast with the old which is transitory."

[172] Already stated by Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.129: when the term "old" appears in 3,14, the context is different.
Differently, Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.325: "old" is to be found by implication in the antithesis of past and present associated with γράμμα and πνεῦμα. Mathias Rissi, *Studien*, 1969, p.24, maintains that "old" lies in the identification of γράμμα with γράφη.

dichotomy. Previous scholarship has made several attempts at an interpretation of these contrasted terms.[173] It is noteworthy that Paul does not use the contrast in the same way as darkness and light is used in for instance 1QS,[174] or the powers of freedom and slavery in the metaphor of the two covenants in Gal 4,21-31, or in the dialectical use of promise and law in Gal 3.[175] The contrast of freedom and slavery refer to status, the point being that one excludes the other. It is of note also that "new" and "old" are left aside, and that the focus shifts. So while Paul in Galatians contrasts social values, freedom and slavery, in an either-or argument, he operates in 2 Corinthians with two existential categories, life and death, arguing theologically or philosophically, not in social terms of belonging.

It seems unlikely that Paul could have had a time aspect in mind with the life-death dichotomy. If he did, the logic would be that the ministry of Moses in the past lead to death and was succeeded by Paul's ministry that leads to life. If this is what Paul meant, the contrast loses its force. If

---

[173] The interpretations related to principles fall in 3 categories:
1. The opposed categories are the literal over against the spiritual, cf. E.-B. Allo, *Seconde Épitre*, 1956, p.95, Jean Héring, *Aux Corinthiens*, 1958, p.36; not widely accepted, however, because it is based on a philosophy no longer prevalent.
Related to this is the interpretation of γράμμα as text, and πνεῦμα as hermeneutical key, cf. Hugo Odeberg, *Till Korintierna*, 1944, p.373-4 and L.J. Koch, *Fortolkning*, 1958, p.177. For three reasons is this a less satisfactory approach, a) it presupposes a narrow understanding of text and interpretation, b) it disregards the dualism, and c) it overlooks that the immediate context is ministry, not interpretation of scripture.
2. The contrast is interpreted in terms of the principles of righteousness and unrighteousness, cf. Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 1960, p.180-3; H. Ulonska, *EvTh* 26, 1966, p.382; Friedrich Lang, In *Rechtfertigung*, 1976, p.270-71; or law replaced by gospel cf. Ernst Käsemann, In *Perspectives on Paul*, 1971, p.149: "The Christian church with its members is the eschatological charter which replaces the Mosaic Torah." This is a perfect example of a replacement model, eschatology shaping a historical reality.
3. γράμμα is a distortion of the true intention of the law, cf. Thomas E. Provence, *NovT* 24, 1982, p.54-81, esp. p.65-68.
Thus, from two different interpretations of the same law, Provence moves on to a definition of the Spirit as a new motivation to keep God's commandment, and in relation to ministry and covenants he makes a distinction in function, legalism against freedom. I accept the idea of two functions of the same law, but question the internalization, Spirit as new motivation.
A variant of this is found in Richard B. Hays, *Echoes*, 1989, p.130-31, who defines *gramma* as "script" (but not scripture). However, when he takes this distinction between a literal and a spiritual exegesis into a distinction between "old" and "new" covenant in succession, this is not very helpful.

[174] See above in Chapter Four I (a).

[175] As argued above, the two covenants in Galatians are two simultaneous ways of relating to God, not temporal covenants.
The antithesis of slavery in Rom 7,6 is different because one type of slavery is opposed to another, defined respectively as relationship to γράμμα and πνεῦμα, see Ernst Käsemann, In *Perspectives*, 1971, p.146-48.

instead life and death refer to the fundamental condition in which all humans share, it is not a human choice of either-or, rather it is a given both-and status. The two terms may then be seen as correlated but not necessarily opposed principles.[176] Moreover as existential principles they can be used to interpret past tradition and scripture as well as present experience, so that both principles underscore both ministries.[177] However, most significantly, they cannot serve the purpose of defining a community's identity.[178] If it is correct that both principles apply at any given time, past present or future, then they are not related to replacement in time.[179] Consequently γράμμα and πνεῦμα should be seen as two existential principles to which both the Jewish and the Christian community are subject, as long as human life is "not yet" the new creation.[180]

This interpretation can also be supported from the context. Thus, it is of note that in both the first expression, τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει, and in the second, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, the present tense is used. This indicates

---

[176] See James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus*, 1975, p.328. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 1991, p.33.46.

[177] Ekkehard Stegemann is probably right when he interprets γράμμα to mean γράφη: "Dass die Antithese nun aber nicht etwa die Schrift gegen den Geist stellt, sondern die Schrift eben unter den Aspekten "Buchstabe" und "Geist" mit unterschiedlichen, ja, gegensätzlichen Funktionen versieht, erhellt allein daraus, wie Paulus im Zusammenhang die Schrift als Zeugnis des Geistes bzw. des Neuen Bundes gebraucht." *ThZ* 42, 1986, p.97-114, esp. p.108.
For a similar idea on γράφη, see Mathias Rissi, *Studien*, 1969, p.24-25, who points to an antithesis of what is written, tied to the old covenant set against the Revelation in Christ, an antithesis of eons, the present world against the future world.
See also Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.61-62.

[178] Note, that when Paul uses contrast terminology to distinguish between inclusion and exclusion of the community, as in 6,14, he draws on a different type of contrast altogether, "light" and "darkness", "righteousness" and "iniquity".

[179] Some take the contrast to mean both time and principle, see e.g. A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.87; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p.130-31; Ernst Käsemann, In *Perspectives*, 1971, p.150-51; James D. G. Dunn, *JTS* 21, 1970, p.310-11; Erich Gräßer, *Bund*, 1985, p.83-84 and Ulrich Luz, *EvTh* 27, 1967, p.318-36, esp. p.325. Peter Richardson, *Israel*, 1969, p.119.
The difficulty with this approach is that γράμμα inevitably is associated with temporariness. When this then is interpreted in a covenant context it leads to replacement. Besides, the positive attitude to law, found elsewhere, is easily overlooked.

[180] The same duality is found in 2 Cor 2,15, and 3,9.
It is the same principle of γράμμα that is behind both the demand for letters of recommendation, rejected in 3,1-3, and the interpretation of Moses that Paul opposes.
Moreover, it is the same Spirit, who, as the liberating power or principle, is present not only in the community, but also experienced by Moses causing the δόξα, and who is referred to as covenant promise to Abraham.
See, Jacob Kremer, In *Begegnung*, 1980, p.210-50.

that time encloses both the creation and the eschaton so that replacement is not the issue.[181] Rather at stake is the quality of humanity's relationship with God, who creates and restores life, the God of life in spite of death. What then are the consequences for identity?

Since Paul's gospel is not a gospel that promises success, but rather a share in the sufferings of Christ (2 Cor 4,9-13), the immediate prospect of following Paul's message is persecution and death. The ultimate hope is life.[182] If present identity is characterised by its share in Christ's suffering, future identity is defined by a share in the resurrection. From this perspective covenant relationship is given an eschatological dimension of restoration that is different from the Sinai covenant. In spite of Moses being glorified, God's power over death has not been revealed to him. This means that if the two ministries of Moses and Paul are compared, Moses was an instrument for the liberation of the people from Egypt, a mediator of the covenant-law[183] while Paul proclaims the message of reconciliation to all humanity and of restoration of its relationship with God. For Moses the people is the goal of God's salvation, for Paul the world is. They have then different horizons: one may be identified as a ministry of death, and the other, correlated or in contrast, a ministry that proclaims life.[184]

In short, because Paul reads the Old Testament traditions, including the whole Sinai tradition, christologically he consequently interprets his own ministry as grounded in a new relationship with God. This does not mean Moses' ministry belongs to an invalid covenant. Rather because the common factor to both Moses and Paul is the divine commission each has a particular task or message from God.[185] The difference between them amounts to Paul's being commissioned to preach life in spite of death, power over death while Moses' vocation was to mediate a covenant relationship limited to Israel. Because Paul's message has this "new" dimension, the covenant relationship has been endowed with newness. By being based on the existential principle

---

[181] The durative aspect must be significant here.

[182] For an excellent exposition of the sufferings as mark of Christian life, see James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus*, 1975, p.328-38. Although he stresses suffering as a condition for all believers, the ecclesiological consequences, that suffering is a mark of Christian identity is not developed.

[183] The designation of Moses as "mediator" is found in Gal 3,20, but not in 2 Corinthians.

[184] In Paul's gospel of reconciliation, God relates to humanity, has the world as a goal. However, although God has reversed this relationship, the Christ event is decisive, and because access to God is through Christ (cf. 2 Cor 1,19-22; Gal 4,4-5), relationship has faith as its boundary.

[185] For Paul this is tied to writing the present letter, including the interpretation of tradition in the light of the Christ event.

of life through and beyond death, the covenant has been reestablished as mediating the relationship between God and humanity. The hope for resurrection, based in the Christ events, points forward to a restoration of creation, a new world order.

(3) Covenant and Glory.

2 Cor 3,7-18 is significant for its midrash on Exod 34,29-35, the story of the second giving of the law.[186] This has as one of its key motifs that Moses appears to the people with glory on his face.[187] Against the background of this incident Paul argues, in an *a minore ad maius* interpretation, for two types of glory, one "greater" than the other. Of note is 3,7 in which the glory on Moses' face is qualified as καταργουμένος.[188] The same participle is used again in v. 11, this time in the neuter. There is some uncertainty as to its meaning. Elsewhere Paul uses the term in a figurative sense, "to make powerless" or to "nullify".[189] What is Paul's purpose in bringing glory into focus here and stating in v.10, "*what was glorious has thus* no *glory* at all"?[190] How does he interpret the Exodus event? From a historical point of view or in an eschatological perspective? What then does covenant stand for?

---

[186] He does not choose Exod 19 where the theophany is in the form of a cloud (v.9) or a smoke of fire (v.18), and where the reaction is amazement (v.18). Nor Exod 24,15 where God appeared in glory as burning fire before the people. Nor Exod 33,12-23, where Moses asks to see God, and sees God from behind.

[187] LXX reads in v.29: δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρώματος, and δεδόξασται is repeated in v.35. The Israelites react (v.30) with "fear".

[188] English translations to καταργουμένος vary, e.g "set aside" as in NRSV, or "fading away" as in RSV.
Commentaries have "was being dome away", thus A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.90; "transient", Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p,57.62; "was being annulled", Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 1984, p.201.203; "was in process of abolition", C.K. Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 1979, p.116.
Most German commentators have "vergänglich", Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924,p.114; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* II, 1949, p.110-11; Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.83; Friedrich Lang, *An die Korinther*, 1986, p.271, Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.63, but we find also "zum Untergang bestimmt", Karl Prümm, *Diakonia Pneumatos* I, 1967, p.112.
Or in French, "destinée à disparaître", as Jean Héring, *Seconde épitre*, 1958, p.37.

[189] Cf. Rom 3,3.31; 1 Cor 1,28; Gal 3,17, and "to set aside" 1 Cor 6,13; 13,11; "to bring to an end" 1 Cor 15,26.
For further details of this term, see the recent study by Scott J. Hafemann, *HBT* 14, 1992, esp. p.37-40. The most important observation he makes is the point that Paul uses "nullify", e.g. 1 Cor 13,11) in the sense that abolishment is linked to "the effects of that which has been brought to an end" (p.38). When this is used of the law in Gal 3,17, it means that the law does not nullify the effects of the covenant promises.

[190] Moffatt's translation with his italics.

"Glory" as almost identical with the divine presence is suggested by the whole Sinai event.[191] However, Paul's particular interpretation of it is far from clear.[192] As one of the major Old Testament texts on covenant relationship it is fundamental to an understanding of Paul's theology of covenant and hence is important to identity. Paul concentrates on Exodus 34, moreover on δόξα, on which I shall focus. Even if there is no identification of covenant and glory, the context points to a relation between the two. This then raises the question, What constitutes the covenant relationship in its original intention? God present as glory? Or covenant based on the principle of law? Or, covenant as promise?

In 2 Corinthians 3,7 Paul's argument proceeds from 3,4-6 as if there were objections to the definition of ministry (3,4-6). He now chooses to focus on glory, God's visible mark and sign of presence. In three conditional sentences, one in the form of a question, two as statements, Paul compares first (v.7-8) the glory of the ministry of death with the ministry of the Spirit; secondly states (in v.9) that there will be greater glory to "the ministry of justification" than to "the ministry of condemnation"; thirdly (in v.11) he opposes the "permanent" to "what is being set aside".[193] In a summary statement in v.10 he answers his own hypothetical questions thus: "in view of the transcendent glory, *what was glorious*[194] *has thus* no *glory* at all". It is immediately clear that the comparison is between unequal concepts, since the contrast is on an abstract level, not related to

---

[191] δόξα renders כבוד, refers to the covenant God from Exod 16,10 onwards, to the manifestation of God's power in a historical event. When Paul uses it here it also has an eschatological connotation, experienced as freedom (3,12.17), confidence (3,4), cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Zweite Korinther*, 1976, p.84-85, against Hans Windisch (*Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p.115) for whom doxa is "Inbegriff aller Heilsgüter, vornehmlich der rein religiösen, wie Gottesgemeinschaft, Gotteskindschaft".
See above in II (1) on Romans, and Chapter One II (1) (c).

[192] Often noted in the numerous studies on this passage, see e.g. Morna D. Hooker, *NTS*, 27, 1981, p.295.
Scott J. Hafemann, Ibid., argues that "Paul is referring to the fact that the veil of Moses brought the glory of God to an end in terms of of that which it would accomplish if not veiled, i.e. the judgment and destruction of Israel" (p.40). This interpretation has the advantage that it reads the Exodus in it context of renewal, moreover, his theological reading referring to judgment is worth considering.

[193] *εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ.* Moffatt's translation correctly presupposes past tense in the protasis, and future in the apodosis, as in first clause, ἐγενηθη (aorist indicative), and the future ἔσται.
Note the acceleration from μᾶλλον (v.7) to πολλῷ μᾶλλον (v. 9 and 11).

[194] *τὸ δεδοξασμένον* is related neither to διακονία nor to δόξα, both being feminine.

concrete matters.[195] If they are not equal, or of the same substance or validity, What are they?

In the course of the argument Paul assumes that glorification in the past was a result of a real encounter. He maintains that there will be an even greater glory in the future, and thus prepares for a definition of glory as a mark of present and future identity (in 3,18, cf. 4,6). A subsidiary motif is the people's fear, which Paul does not comment on here. Another motif is Moses' use of the veil serving as a sign of the boundary to God. His interpretation is related to the previous passage with its dualism of death and life. While he presupposes that both ministries, his own and that of Moses, can be seen in a context of glory, he nevertheless argues for a difference. Although the difference is asserted, the glory of Moses is not denied.[196] Paul rather look backwards from a future greater glory to what is an already accepted greatness of the past.

In this way the past Sinai event serves as the foundation for a hope of a fuller experience of glory in the future. By using eschatology as a corrective factor, Sinai has importance as origin, but glory has Christ and Spirit as orientation, Christ being the model, the Spirit proof. Thus the temporal aspect of Sinai is less important; rather glory becomes the purpose of humanity or creation.

It is important not to underestimate the point of validity of the glory Moses encountered. Yet, in spite of its validity, Paul goes beyond the Exodus story by adding the point of termination, explicitly in the phrase, *διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην*. What is the purpose of emphasising glory when at the same time a reservation on duration is introduced? From the point of view of identity, How can Paul justify such statements?

---

[195] Because the two participles in v 11, *τὸ καταργούμενον* and *τὸ μένον*, are not related to a noun and both in the neuter, they are equal to abstract nouns. They are therefore best translated in a general sense: "what was glorious" (in a historical sense) and "what lasts" (in an eschatological sense).
Morna D. Hooker, *NTS* 27, 1981, p.299, suggests, the neuter is used as a term to sum up, maybe refer back to *τὸ γράμμα*, which she takes as "certainly being abrogated." While I agree with the first statement, I question whether abrogation is so certain. As I read the phrase, *γράμμα* gets its qualification from the antithetical *πνεῦμα*, therefore it is associated with death.

[196] Commentators generally agree on this, see e.g. Hans Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p.113-14; A. Plummer, *Second Corinthians*, 1966, p.90; C.K. Barrett, *Second Corinthians*, 1979, p.115; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 1984, p.227; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.62; and Christian Wolff, *Zweite Korinther*, 1989, p.67.
For Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 1960, p.176-80, glory is a sign of authority.

Since there is no evidence of a glory "set aside" in the Old Testament, this must be Paul's own interpretation. There is also no evidence that this is a criticism aimed at Jewish identity, so it cannot be an exclusive polemical attack on Judaism, or Judaizers.[197] Rather it seems aimed at his contemporary readers, and must serve some purpose in the context of the Christian community and its coming to terms with the past. The issue is probably, how to interpret God's presence. This means that if there is a polemical tone in Paul's interpretation it belongs within the Christian community.[198] Moreover, in the present context, Paul states that the way God's glory is revealed now is through the visible presence of the Spirit, and assumes that this is recognised as the same glory as that of the Sinai event, although he gives the latter a negative connotation. Why does Paul refer to glory as καταργόυμενος (v.7, 11 and 14)? Why the point that there is "no longer glory" compared to what "once was glorified", οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον (v.10)? Why introduce the motif of the veil that "still lies over the "old" covenant" (v.14)? Is the real issue a definition of God?

One possible explanation is that Paul's eschatological and christological theology forces him to formulate a negative view on the termination of glory as part of a theology of replacement.[199] Another possibility, perhaps more likely, is that Paul is up against a different view of renewal. If, as in Romans, some interpret "new covenant" in a literal sense the danger is that covenant becomes based on the principle of law, eventually diminishing the importance of the Christ event.[200] Because Paul sees the eschaton as having been inaugurated with Christ, and the presence of God as no longer enclosed by spatial boundaries, the only possible conclusion is that the leading principle is no longer the same. So while he acknowledges God as δόξα, he also prescribes to the idea of the dynamic of God, and therefore he can arrive at the interpretation that the past revelation of God contains something that may disappear in the future, to be of no effect, to become power-

---

[197] Against P.W. Barnett, *JSNT* 22, 1984, p.3-17, who in reference to C.K. Barrett states that the opposition was "Judaizing Jews" against whom Paul teaches "that the Old Covenant has been eclipsed, de-glorified, by the surpassing splendour of the New Covenant (2 Cor 3.9-11)." Also Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 1986, p.64.
More to the point is Murphy-O'Connor, *ABR* 34, 1986, p.50-51, who holds the view that Paul uses the Exodus story because he had been unfavourably compared to Moses.

[198] Cf. Ekkehard Stegemann, *ThZ*, 42, 1986, p.106.

[199] See e.g. J.-F. Collange, *Enigmes*, 1972, p.76; but especially, N.T. Wright, *The Climax*, 1991, p.181.

[200] Thus I agree with the observation of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Theology*, 1991, p.33.

less.[201] If this is correct, the expression ἡ καταργουμένη δόξα, can, on the one hand, affirm the past experience of glory as valid; yet, on the other, a particular glory may, as a result of the Christ event, no longer have the same significance.

Inasmuch as both the Christ event and the covenants with Israel are historically based, there is a time aspect that cannot be denied. A historical reading, however, too easily leads to linear covenants and replacement. It is only in retrospect one can conclude that the glory of Christ was greater than what was before, not the other way. From the perspective of Christ there is a "ministry of condemnation".[202] By using Christ as foundation of righteousness and the eschatological fulfilment as goal of creation (cf. 2 Cor 1,20; Rom 7,6-7; 8,3-8) Paul can compare the visible presence of God's glory in Christ to the visible glory once reflected on the face of Moses, and postulate the latter as "less powerful".[203] There is no reference to a covenant that had no effect or power. That would be to deny God's revelation in history.[204]

This interpretation is in accordance with 1 Cor 2,6, where Paul writes of a perfect wisdom as opposed to the wisdom of this age. More relevant perhaps is 1 Cor 13,10-11: "when the complete comes, the partial will come to an end".[205] Here the point is that in Christ both imperfection and perfection have been given a different value. If the difference between the glory of the face of Moses and the glory of Christ is understood in terms of perfection, then what matters is quality; the temporal aspect is secondary

---

[201] I agree with the critique of Rudolf Bultmann's interpretation by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *EvTh* 41, 1981, p.231: "Es is mit dieser Doxa auch nach Paulus noch keineswegs vorbei".
But it is significant that this type of language still has time as focus.

[202] See E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 1983, p.138 in a comment on 2 Cor 3,10f.: "The simplest explanation of this dual form of contrast seems to be that he came to relegate the Mosaic dispensation to a less glorious place *because* he found something more glorious and that he *then*, thinking in black-and-white terms, developed the death/life contrast. I cannot see how the development could have run the other way, from an initial conviction that the law only condemns and kills, to a search for something which gives life, to the conviction that life comes by faith in Christ, to the statement that the law lost its glory because a new dispensation surpasses it in glory".

[203] To interpret, as Ingo Hermann does, v.11 τὸ καταργούμενον to mean the visible glory on the face of Moses is indestructible and inferior, and set it over against an invisible glory of the new covenant is not very convincing, see *Kyrios und Pneuma*. 1961, p.31-32. The point of Paul's comparison is that both are visible.

[204] Against Earl Richard, *RevBibl* 88, 1981, p.352-54, I maintain that there is no denial of the glory as being real. The antithesis of new to old is not used, nor is there a mention of a replaced glory.

[205] RSV has "when the perfect comes the imperfect will pass away".

to this. If this is correct, it is possible to maintain that the glory of God is present whenever Moses is read as revelation.[206] Yet when Christ brings the covenant relationship into existence by his visible presence, only then can the "old" covenant be interpreted according to its true potential, not replaced but reestablished or restored.[207]

What is remarkable about Paul's argument on glory, then, is the all embracing view of time and eternity. By embracing past, present and future Paul can define identity from an eschatological perspective, both as having a goal and as grounded in tradition, because his theology has creation as its foundation and perfection in Christ as its counterpart.

Thus, Paul interprets the glory of God as encountered by Moses from the point of view of a more perfect glory, visible in Christ and the Spirit. Simultaneously a reevaluation and devaluation takes place. Paul declares there to be an end to the glory of the past, but can do so only from the point of view of the eschaton. From there a termination is clear. But only when all creation is transformed to the glory of Christ is the renewal of creation complete, and at that point the covenant relationship is visible, marked by the glory of Christ and the Spirit. This means covenant identity is no longer the same and can no longer be the same, because both present and past identity are shaped, not primarily from a past event, as for instance the Sinai encounter with God, but primarily from a glory that has quality and visible focus in Christ.

To sum up. When Paul uses the covenant in 2 Corinthians he seems to do so in passing. The background for his use is the Old Testament renewal, the Sinai event being related to reestablishment, but not replacement. This shows that covenant is used as a metaphor for relationship with God, and that, as part of the Old Testament heritage, the term cannot be abandoned. Therefore the Sinai event as a story of encounter with God as glory has its positive value. It is remarkable that Paul goes from "new" to "old". This shows an appreciation not only of Moses as minister of the covenant par excellence, but of the historical tradition in its potential for a perfect relationship between God and humanity and fulfilment thereof. However, the ethno-centric covenant is too limited for such a new relationship. That needs to be based on faith in Christ. And not only is it too limited: if taken literally, it leads to death and not to Christ. Covenant as relationship with God is the same "old" covenant but given a new dimension. On the one hand, the "new"

---

[206] See Ekkehard Stegemann, *ThZ* 42, 1986, p.111.

[207] This is in line with Paul's interpretation of the Abraham covenant in Galatians.

builds on the "old" by presupposing that "old" has validity and quality. On the other, the potential of the "old" is visible only in its fulness in the "new". With this a universal covenant relationship has emerged. Inherent in this is the idea that the Spirit is a pledge of the coming state of righteousness, of freedom and power, as well as the goal for transformation. God's covenant glory, once present at Sinai, is now manifest in Christ and reinforced as the Spirit that gives life. Simultaneously a particularism with faith in Christ as boundary is introduced. When identity builds on a common faith and shared sufferings combined with a shared hope, identity marks are distinct in their christo-centricity. Because faith is faith in a covenant creator God in whom power over life and death is found, the ability to change covenant relationships lies with God at any time. History is important for past identity but it is only one dimension of the covenant relationship and not the most important. The implication of covenant being eschatologically based for Christian identity is that there are different ways of relating to the same God. Christian identity is based on faith, marked by the Spirit and has δόξα of the Spirit and Christ as its goal and purpose.

V. Conclusion.

Having looked at the Pauline letters and focused on covenant and covenants, I conclude that they have both an aspect of newness and share Old Testament traditions. However, since Paul consistently uses Christ as the hermeneutical key for interpreting relationship with God in general, and the covenant relationship in particular, the Old Testament is read theologically, not historically. This means that the linear aspect, the idea of a continuous process, is, if not absent, less relevant.

Because Paul sees the covenant relationship as valid, he can use it as a frame of reference in Romans, Galatians and 2 Corinthians, in each case with a different purpose. The different situations of the communities addressed in the letters, others' different use of the covenant, and a particular interpretation of "new covenant" that ties covenant to law, are likely reasons for Paul's usage and interpretation of the covenant, accepting it, yet reinterpreting it by emphasising a different or new dimension.

It is noteworthy that the three letters draw on different Old Testament traditions: the Abraham traditions, the Sinai event and the prophets. They therefore feature different interpretations of the covenant in general and renewal thereof in particular. I found that replacement is not a helpful model, charged as it is with feelings of superiority, and suggest that the texts be read from a different perspective. Where Romans concentrates on the

validity of God's covenant for Israel, Galatians draws on covenant interpreted as promise, and 2 Corinthians on presence of God then and now. By highlighting the presence of God as glory, and moreover giving different value to different types of glory, covenant is assessed, and valued in its oldness and its newness. In the course of this Paul rejects "new" when this is based on a principle of law, and accepts "old" in its potential as prophecy pointing to Christ or the Spirit. This shows first of all that Paul is flexible in his interpretation, and secondly that Paul has a nuanced view of what covenant relationship is. Covenant must be seen also in relation to his overall theology, particularly to the idea of God as power of creation, God acting in the Christ event and the presence of the Spirit in the community.

It is equally conspicuous, although it is too often overlooked, that Paul never uses the term "covenant" as a designation for the Christian community. It is striking that in the contexts where the term is used its Old Testament background is interpreted christologically, not ecclesiologically. The explanation for this is that Paul found covenant as a term inadequate, if and when it is overloaded with ethno-centric values, or builds on a principle opposed to the principle of promise, freedom and the Spirit. For an ecclesiological identity other terms containing the aspect of sociality are preferred, such as ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, or family-related terminology, τέκνα θεοῦ or υἱοθεσία, or ministry related, such as κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ. Christian identity is primarily expressed in terms of "belonging to" or "being in" Christ, or "having received" the Spirit, never as being in the covenant. It is therefore also significant that the expression, known from the Dead Sea Scrolls, "enter the covenant" is not found in Paul. There is no explanation as to why this is the case, and if I were to speculate, the reason seems to be that in Paul's theology covenant is primarily established by God, guaranteed by the power of God, and renewed by God when broken, hence brought to its full potential in Christ. Therefore its validity is independent of human affirmation. However I shall refrain from further speculation on this matter.

Having Gentiles and the mission to the Gentile world as scope, Paul proclaims a relationship with God in universal rather than ethnic terms. When he uses ethnic categories, he states that they are limited in value, or even, when reinterpreted through Christ, of no value. Although ethnic Israel exists, and has special status because of the past, it is when it exists as "God's Israel" (cf. Gal 6,16) that its true quality and relationship with God is realised. In the same way it is only when the church exists as "the church of God", with god-given boundaries, not limited by human values, that

the true quality and purpose of its existence is realised.

Several times Paul draws on a universal aspect: he gives a new dimension to the covenant relationship; the covenant is promise, not law; the covenant is valid for humanity, with freedom, not slavery as the leading principle; the essence of a relationship with God is a child-parent relationship. All this entails abandonment of a covenant relationship that seeks identity in land with national boundaries. It does not mean, however, that social relationships have no boundaries. It means there are different boundaries, and different values for setting these boundaries.

CHAPTER SEVEN

BOUNDARIES REDEFINED - BOUNDARIES REPLACED.

The remaining question for this chapter is: If the pattern of interdependence between identity and boundary rites is traced in Paul's letters, how far does a shift in identity effect Paul's view of circumcision and baptism? It should be clear from the conclusion in the previous chapter that Paul uses covenantal terminology positively, essentially as a term expressing the vertical relationship with God. However, when he wants to express horizontal relationships he clearly prefers different ecclesiological categories for social belonging. Unless this is appreciated, one cannot fully understand the difference between baptism and circumcision. It is significant that in reinterpreting past identity for the present community Paul can affirm three things: the covenant has eternal validity; it contains divine promise; and covenant renewal is not renewal of the law in its traditional sense. It is equally significant that the Christian Paul refrains from using the covenant term in its social and horizontal aspects. Since for Paul Christian identity is based on a christo-centric faith it is different from ethnic covenant identity. How far, then, is Paul concerned with external boundaries which set barriers according to birth in opposition to identity based on choice with boundaries of commitment? Does the introduction of baptism reflect a changed social identity or merely a changed status in relation to God? Or both?

I shall now demonstrate that changed identity is the reason for Paul's redefinition of circumcision inasmuch as his christo-centric identity influences his theology of ritual boundaries. The challenge is to understand not only why circumcision, the previous boundary *par excellence*, concerns Paul, but also why it is replaced. Another challenge is to show that to "baptise" can be taken literally by explaining that it makes sense as identity being ritually expressed. This means that a number of fundamental questions need to be asked again from the perspective of identity and boundaries: What are the criteria used when circumcision is reevaluated? When baptism is a boundary mark, what exactly is marked by this boundary? Does Paul interpret baptism as a change of belief, or as an entry into a community that is within the Jewish people or opposed to it? Did the early church by introducing baptism begin its separation from Judaism or was baptism not a dividing issue? Why is entry into the covenant never addressed?

Because of the limitations of this study,[1] I shall deal only with circumcision and baptism in their specific function as boundary rites. Although an analysis of purity and other rites could throw light on the problem, it would be too comprehensive to be included.[2] While it is possible to see the eucharist as a boundary rite, related as it is to shared covenantal meals and thus to self-understanding, this is not my task. One could doubtless argue that it belongs to the same pattern of interdependence I have traced, but I shall refrain from this. Such a discussion would be beyond the parameters which feasibility imposes on this study, and must be postponed to a future occasion.

I. Previous Research on Baptism in Its Relation to Circumcison.

No attempt will be made to give a complete survey of previous research on baptism in its relation to circumcision.[3] I shall draw attention to the need to reexamine both baptism and circumcision by highlighting the most important studies and their significance with special attention to both rites as boundary marks. While acknowledging that some recent works have been aware of important factors of identity in Judaism by pointing to circumcision as an identity mark of Israel, it is clear that their concern is not with the parallel pattern between the Jewish rite of circumcision and Christian baptism; the perspective is not the same.[4] My review will show that while scholars focused on baptism in relation to origin from its Jewish antecedents (including the baptism administered by John), its Hellenistic parallels, its sacramental character compared to the baptism of John, and its connection with individual faith and salvation, they nevertheless tended

---

[1] See my Introduction.

[2] The same goes for an analysis of a redefinition of doctrinal, ethical and social boundaries.

[3] For previous surveys of research, see Werner Georg Kümmel, *ThR* 51, 1986, p.239-58, and earlier in *ThR* 17, 1948-49, p.42-45, 18, 1950, p.32-47.
It is noteworthy that sociological studies have not given much attention to baptism, see e.g. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World*, 1981, p.147, for whom baptism is a symbolic passage from outside to inside the church. Or Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches*, 1988, p.65-69, who, while she connects baptism with "entrance into the sect", acknowledges its significance of "abolition of differences of Gal 3:28" (cf.p.66) and sees it as a cleansing rite "that symbolizes a transition .. into the sect", fails to see how Paul's theology of self-understanding leads to the conclusion that the requirements for entry into a Christian community of both Jews and Gentiles are the same: baptism (cf. p.67).

[4] For understanding circumcision as identity and/or boundary mark, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, in *Jewish and Christian Self-definition*, 1981, p.125-27; J. Marcus, *NTS* 35, 1989, p.67-81; James D.G. Dunn, *The Partings*, 1991, p.28-29. 124-27; also his article in *Paulus und das antike Judentum*, 1991, p.295-312; E.P. Sanders, *Judaism*, 1992, p.213-4.

to overlook the initiatory function.[5] This neglect is my starting point and I shall seek to develop what baptism and circumcision have in common when both are seen as boundary rites showing that they have different functions, and why. In doing so I shall question the views that baptism is primarily an individual's response to coming to faith and that baptism can be explained from its historical antecedents, and instead argue that baptism needs an ecclesiological dimension if its nature is to be appreciated. Thus it should be clear that additional work is needed.

1. At the outset I wish to mention Oscar Cullmann's, *Baptism*, 1950, since this study has been highly influential to subsequent scholarship.[6] His view that baptism is fulfilment and replacement of circumcision entry to the new covenant just as circumcision was entry to the old covenant (p.56-57) is often taken at face value by other scholars.[7] From the point of view of how the Christian church and Judaism developed over the centuries, the former to become an institution which used infant baptism as an entry rite and rejected circumcision as a sign of belonging while the latter became not simply a people but a religion, this is sociologically and historically correct.[8] From the standpoint of why baptism became related to the identity of the Christian church as a boundary rite, i.e. the rationale of baptism, this position is not correct.[9] The main problem with Cullmann's view is that

---

[5] An exception is the approach of Nils Alstrup Dahl in *NTT* 56, 1955, p.46, who has the point that baptism is "an initiation of those who are to approach God and worship him".

[6] See my Introduction, especially note 10.

[7] See e.g. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World*, 1981, p.147; Lars Hartman, *Auf den Namen*, 1992, p.96.
See also the statement in the opening section of the report from the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM) in 1982, that baptism is "entry into the New Covenant between God and God's people" (BEM 1,1).

[8] See Chapter One, note 73.
However, this view builds on a salvation-historical approach of development from Judaism to Christianity, assuming the superiority of the "new covenant" and a replacement of rites in time and quality.

[9] The parallelism between circumcision and baptism hinges on evidence from Col 2,11; Rom 2,25ff; 4,1ff; Gal 3,6ff and Eph 2,11ff. And in none of these texts is circumcision described as a rite of entry into the covenant. I see no clear idea of replacement. Moreover, Cullmann overlooks that circumcision in the Jewish background is primarily a rite of covenant affirmation, not a rite of conversion-initiation that marks a change of religion.
Proselyte baptism is treated along with circumcision, and this too is superseded by Christian baptism, cf. p.65.
For a different view see, Reginald H. Fuller, in *Made, Not Born*, 1976, p.8, who cautiously states that there is "no direct line leading from Old Testament circumcision to Christian baptism, and the connection was drawn only in the subapostolic age. The most we can say is that circumcision provided the idea that membership of the people of God, whether under the old covenant or

it builds on the idea that the covenant is an ecclesiological category in both Judaism and Christianity. More problematic are the views that the church is "quantitatively increased through the 'addition' of those who are baptised" (p.32), and that baptism essentially is a divine act (p.33) through which "salvation advances into the time of the Church" (p.34). By preferring "causal efficacy" as opposed to the cognitive function he sets a false alternative. When I suggest that baptism is looked upon as initiation, the advantage is that both entry to a social relationship and to the church as divine institution are taken into account. Thus, the rite can symbolise incorporation into a community that sees itself as the body of Christ and it can build on visible manifestations of the eschatological gift of the Spirit as sign of divine institution.

2. The most comprehensive study, still, is the classic monograph of G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 1962. Although Beasley-Murray gives some attention to the issue of entry into the visible church, he parallels baptism with proselyte baptism and treats circumcision as part of an initiation process (cf. p.28-29). His observation on different functions of the two is worth noting (p.340). Thus, "For the belief that circumcision has been replaced in the Church by baptism by no means automatically involves the corollary that the two rites have identical significance or identical administration" (p.157). However, when he states that the purpose of the individual's baptism into the church is to "be united with the Christ in his saving work by the Spirit" (p.281), the focus clearly shifts from ecclesiological initiation to eschatological salvation.

3. As an example of a somewhat outdated scholarship, I mention Herbert Braun, who in *Qumran und das Neue Testament* II, 1966, states that Christian baptism cannot have its origin in the Qumran washings. He can do so only because he focuses on the fact that these baptismal rites are repeated rites rather than on the fact that they are rites that affirm a collective belonging (p.28). Thus he overlooks the real parallelism. If the identity aspect is taken into consideration a reassessment of Christian baptism in relation to the "Qumran washings" is needed.

4. James D.G. Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 1970, is significant for its emphasis on the importance of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the process of conversion-initiation, thereby stressing that "baptism and circumcision are related not because baptism fulfils the hope of spiritual circumcision, but because both vividly depict Christ's death and the reality of the

---

the new, is not by nature or birth but by insertion into a *Heilsgeschichte*."

spiritual transformation effected by the Spirit in the hearts of the convert" (p.157). While he clearly is aware of a different relation between circumcision and baptism, compared to Cullmann, his particular view of baptism needs further attention. The lack of emphasis on corporate belonging is one point;[10] another concerns the fact that Dunn has not updated his views on baptism in the light of his later research in which identity and boundaries feature;[11] hence the need for a supplementary study. Here I wish to challenge his view that baptism is only a metaphor for the experience of the Spirit, by drawing attention to the ecclesiological aspect of the baptism thereby offer a corrective. I shall argue that water baptism in conversion-initiation can function as a symbol for change, that it can mark the occasion on which entry to the church takes place. Moreover I shall suggest that the sociological term, "boundary", which Dunn elsewhere uses in the expression "boundary marker", may effectively be applied not only to "works of law" but also to baptism.

5. The historical inquiry into the background and meaning of New Testament baptism by Gerhard Barth, in *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit*, 1981, is noteworthy. He makes a point of showing the development of baptism in the early church from that of John, of seeing Paul's baptism in relation to Gospel. Consequently he finds that baptism has its foundation and reason in the Christ event ("das Christusgeschehen begründet das Taufgeschehen", p.103). However, this study is unsatisfactory mainly because it focuses on origin, on christology rather than ecclesiology. Circumcision plays no role in the origin of baptism.

6. Further, I wish to draw attention to the collection of articles published by the Institute for New Testament in Aarhus, *Dåben i Ny Testamente*, 1982. It attempts to summarise New Testament ideas of baptism and draw some conclusions for how the churches understand and practise baptism to-day. Of particular relevance to the present study is the article by Johannes Nissen on the early church's baptism as a sociological factor. His observation that the Christian church stands for equality, human dignity and service in love needs to be further elaborated. His view that in baptism the church commemorates the social change that takes place in every baptism is a

---

[10] See for instance, *The Partings*, 1991, in which baptism is treated in an Appendix on unity and diversity of the church, not as an identity marker, cf. p.271-72.

[11] First used by Dunn in *NTS* 31, 1985, p.524, in reference to Hans Mol, *Identity and the Sacred*, 1976. Note, that he uses "boundary markers" of "works of the law", not of the baptismal rite. In a similar way, but less distinct, he uses the expression "identity markers" already in *BJRL* 65, 1983, p.108.

challenge to both a historical approach and tendencies to interpret baptism as an individual act of commitment.[12]

7. The theological approach by Udo Schnelle, in *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart*, 1983, is important as a thematic study of Paul's baptism. The difficulty is the relation to soteriology. While this is important, salvation is by no means the only aspect of significance. And while Schnelle addresses the issue of baptism as entry, he also subordinates it to christology. He makes no attempt to draw on sociological knowledge which is unsatisfactory since it gives a distorted perspective on the Pauline baptismal practise.

8. Finally, I draw attention to the various studies of Lars Hartman,[13] recently readdressed in his monograph, *Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus*, 1992. By stressing that New Testament baptism cannot be understood except by acknowledging its diversity, Hartman makes clear that no systematic teaching on baptism is available. The weakness is, however, that he is more concerned with christological and eschatological aspects than with church entry; moreover, he too shows no interest in the social function of baptism.

All these studies are important since they provide readers with scholarly insights that build on exegetical skill. Caution is needed when they see circumcision as parallel to baptism. The historical development of and breach between Judaism and Christianity should not be read back into the New Testament texts. Before I reexamine the major texts I shall summarise my critique in four points:

1. The main problem with taking baptism as an individual's expression of faith in Christ, is that it neglects both the ecclesiological and the social dimension. That entry to faith means entry into a community that understands itself as church and builds its faith on a shared belief needs to be considered. That entry to faith also means entry to a different social life-style with equal status of all believers as actual goal needs to be borne in mind.

2. The fundamental problem with focusing on the origin of baptism is that Christian baptism is either opposed to its Jewish background or contrasted

---

[12] Cf. p.202-30.
My own contribution is an article on Initiation in Acts, later reworked and translated into German, see *StTh* 40, 1986, p.55-79. By considering the eschatological, the ecclesiological and the christological aspects of baptism in Acts I conclude that baptism is a rite that seems in continuation of Jewish rituals and of John's eschatological baptism, but it is reinterpreted ecclesiologically and christologically.

[13] See my Bibliography.

to it, and builds on developmental or fulfilment ideas. Parallelism, with both having the same function while reflecting different identities, is not considered.

3. While some acknowledge the aspect of initiation, the underlying assumption is that initiation should be explained from the perspective of history of religion, so that the ecclesiological background is not taken into consideration.[14]

4. The main difficulty with interpreting baptism historically is that questions of origin and development cannot be definitively answered for lack of data. The advantage of including a sociological approach is that it has the potential of shedding light on the differentiation of rites, and of dealing with how the church constitutes itself ritually.

This indicates that more work is needed. I propose to concentrate here on the two rites, circumcision and baptism by focusing on the relation between boundary rite and group self-understanding. I shall not focus on baptism and circumcision as an individual's experience, their soteriological aspect, or eschatological meaning. By looking at baptism as the rite whereby a community expresses both its social and its religious identity, I shall attempt to give a corrective answer to the question: What boundaries are marked by circumcision and baptism? What, then, is the identity behind the rituals?

II. Circumcision: A Redefined or A Replaced Rite?

When the New Testament writers use the terminology of circumcision they use it in both a literal and a metaphorical sense.[15] This is in line with usage in the Old Testament, Jubilees, CD and 1QS.[16] However, where these writings

---

[14] This is the case when scholars focus on the individual's salvation, on the relation between baptism and faith, and baptism and grace.This was also the case in the debate on infant baptism, between Kurt Aland and Joachim Jeremias. See my bibliography on the works of these two writers.

[15] The most important texts on circumcision are found in the Pauline letters and in Luke-Acts. Thus, *περιτέμνω*: Luke 1,59; 2,21; Acts 7,8; 15,1.5.24; 16,3; 21,21; 1 Cor 7,18; Gal 2,3; 5,2.3; 6,12.13; Col 2,11.
περιτομή: Acts 7,8; 10,45; 11,2; Rom 2,25.26.27.28.29; 3,1.30; 4,9.10.11.12; 15,8; 1 Cor 7,19; Gal 2,7.8.9.12; 5,6.11; 6,15; Eph 2,11; Phil 3,3.5; Col 2,11; 3,11; 4,11. Tit 1,10.
In the Johannine context: John 7,22.23.
It is of note that Hebrews has, in spite of a strong covenantal theology, no circumcision terminology, nor a theology related to circumcision. This can be interpreted as lack of interest in circumcision as a rite, moreover, as a lack of need for a reinterpretation.
A metaphorical use (as in Rom 2,29 and Acts 7,51) is only meaningful against a literal use (as in Phil 3,5).

[16] See especially Jub 1,23; CD 16,6; 1QS 5,5, cf. 1QpHab 11,13.

clearly refer to circumcision in a covenantal context, Paul, as I shall demonstrate, dissociates circumcision from the covenant, ignores the mandate to circumcise in spite of its position in Genesis, and redefines it. By approaching the issue from a different perspective than that of it being a covenant obligation, Paul clearly goes beyond traditional interpretation of circumcision. Since both the theology and the practice of circumcision need to be assessed in the light of his Christian self-understanding, the issue is related to boundaries.

Above I suggested that when covenant identity was defined in ethnic terms, circumcision was made the most important ethnic boundary rite.[17] And when covenant identity was defined narrowly to concern only part of Israel, covenantal boundaries were rather boundaries <u>within</u> the ethnic covenant.[18] As this is the background for Paul, the issue of circumcision can be defined as one of <u>identity</u>. Moreover since Paul's arguments are theological and not simply concerned with the relation between Jews and Gentiles, the issue is not only one of ethnic identity, rather of how to draw <u>boundaries</u>. Thus it is too simplistic to suggest that circumcision is abandoned to make it easier for Gentiles to join the church.[19] Even if Paul's arguments imply that ethnic identity is no longer important, the reasons for questioning the rite are found in Paul's christo-centric identity, not in the fact that circumcision is unacceptable for Gentiles.[20] Moreover, from the point of view of boundaries to distinguish between the act and the state of circumcision is not sufficiently nuanced.[21] I acknowledge the difference, but such a distinction does <u>not</u> take the theological meanings and sociological interpretations of circumcision into account and therefore offers no real explanation as to why circumcision is redefined and/or replaced.

In Chapter One I suggested <u>four</u> <u>aspects</u> and functions of circumcision: (1) a fertility rite, (2) a sign of perfection, (3) a cultic boundary mark, and

---

[17] Cf. Chapter Two.

[18] Cf. Chapters Three and Four.

[19] As does Francis Watson, *Paul*, 1986, p.28.

[20] Note that John J. Collins has analysed a number of texts and found that circumcision is often ignored. It plays no role in writings like Jos.Ase; T.Abr; T.Job; 2 Enoch, where identity is defined "through ethics and piety", not in terms of ritual practice. See *Between Athens*, 1986, p.213-15; 224; 228; 231.

[21] This distinction given by C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1975, p.171-73. Thus he takes *περιτομή* to mean 1) the act of circumcision, 2) the state of being circumcised, 3) the community; and *ἀκροβυστία* as 1) the foreskin (literal), 2) the state of being uncircumcised, 3) the community of uncircumcised.

(4) a symbol of renewal.[22] I shall now consider these in the Pauline context, to draw my conclusions regarding identity and boundaries. Overall, it is remarkable that Paul never refers to the command to Abraham to circumcise in Gen 17,10-14, nor does he refer to circumcision as a covenant sign, as does Luke in Acts 7,8. That circumcision in Genesis is essential as covenant obedience is not commented on. Besides, it is worth noting that Paul in Galatians makes no demand of Jews by birth to give up a traditional practice.[23]

The most important texts are: Galatians 5,2-12; 6,12-16 and Romans 2,25-29; 4,9-12.[24] Although they appear in different contexts, they are concerned with the changes that relate to ritual boundaries.

Thus, in Gal 5,2-12[25] Paul concludes his arguments on freedom and slavery in the previous passage, 4,21-5,1,[26] by opposing the two covenants and applying the two principles, freedom and slavery, to the practice of circumcision. While circumcision is prominent in the overall argument, it is also significant that circumcision is not contrasted to baptism which is not mentioned apart from 3,27. In Gal 6,12-16 Paul denounces the practice of circumcision in the conclusion to the letter.[27] This passage functions as a postscript and summary of Paul's main points of concern: the centrality of the cross makes circumcision - non-circumcision stand out as a false alternative; "new creation" is the real issue.[28] In Romans 4 he interprets the Abraham tradition, in a Midrash of Gen 15,6, quoted in 4,3 and elaborated in the rest of chapter.[29] Paul's central concern here is to identify Abraham as

---

[22] For these aspects, see Chapter One II (2) (a).

[23] Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.44; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.231; Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.165.201; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.261.269.

[24] The point in 1 Cor 7,19-20 that before God it matters not what state one was in when called, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, is rather too ambiguous to use as a basic text.

[25] Most commentaries take 5,1-12 as a unity. Thus, Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.228-41; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.342-64; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.253-70; Joachim Rohde, *An die Galater*, 1988, p.210-225; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.220-35.

[26] See above in Chapter Six note 81 on the context of Gal 3,1-5,12.

[27] See the various commentaries, esp. Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.279-85; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.409-421; Joachim Rohde, *An die Galater*, 1988, p.270-81; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.285-301.

[28] I prefer the translation, "creation" to "creature", cf. 2 Cor 5,17.

[29] For details see commentaries, e.g. Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.68-76; Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.99-122; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.224-255; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.194-

father of both Jews and Gentiles, cf. 4,4-21; hence also to establish the lack of difference between circumcised and uncircumcised in 4,9-12. It is of note that Paul in the concluding passage of 4, v.23-25, applies scripture to his contemporary readers by demonstrating that justification is God's gift now to all who believe, even outside the covenant. Finally, Romans 2,25-29 is part of a discussion on the position of the Jews distinct from Gentiles, in 2,1-3,20; of this 2,12-29 stands out as a section on the doctrine of God's impartiality.[30] The whole section clearly reflects the theological conflict between Jews and Christians. The same is true of 2,17-24 in which Paul argues that privileges imply obligations; hence his concern with circumcision which he views as renewal in 2,25-29: circumcision is valid only as true (spiritual) circumcision.[31] In short, what these texts have in common is, on the one hand, a lack of interest in circumcision as a sign of the covenant; on the other, they reinterpret circumcision which has a bearing on how boundaries are defined.

(1) Circumcision in its original function as a fertility rite was, as we have seen, already forgotten or had lost its significance in Judaism, in spite of the connection to the covenant promise of offspring.[32] I have explained as a change in self-understanding the fact that other interpretations took over and gained influence in Judaism before the New Testament time.[33] As a corollary to this Paul too regards circumcision without fertility being relevant. Instead he reinterprets circumcision from the perspective of his christology and pneumatology.

(2) The often overlooked aspect of perfection I have explained as a theological interpretation reflecting that circumcision has the potential to make creation complete.[34] If the view, found e.g. in Jub 15,27, but also Jub 2,19, that through this rite a sanctification and a change of status before God takes place, is contemporary to the New Testament, it raises questions regarding Paul's teaching.[35] If "perfection" is at stake, this would explain

---

241.

[30] See, e.g. Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.48; Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.21; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.136; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.51.

[31] Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.108.118.

[32] Cf. Chapter One, p.37.

[33] Thus Jubilees interprets circumcision not only as sign of the covenant, but also as individual affirmation of being born within the covenant and as symbol of perfection or holiness, see above in Chapter Two II (2).

[34] See above in Chapter One II (2) (a) and Chapter Two II (2).

[35] For a parallel interpretation see, J. Duncan Derrett, *EQ* 63, 1991, p.215-17, who draws on "completion" as a background to John 7,22-23.

first the statement, that circumcision is of no benefit in Gal 5,2-12; and secondly why he in Gal 6,13-14 uses καυχαόμαι in relation to both circumcision and the cross. And if this aspect is behind Romans 4,9-12, another look at the text is needed. The question is, Does Paul replace or redefine circumcision because perfection has been linked to the rite? Does Paul suggest a different interpretation of identity and boundaries by linking circumcision and righteousness rather than circumcision and perfection?

First, Galatians 5,2-12. Here Paul clearly argues against circumcision by referring to freedom in Christ in 4,31-5,1, particularly when he states that circumcision is of no effect, no power.[36] From the point of view of freedom, salvation and justification both law in general and circumcision in particular are false alternatives to Christ (cf. 5,1-6). The climax is Paul's fierce attack on his opponents, suggesting that circumcision is equal to "mutilation".[37] Paul clearly attacks those who practise circumcision as an expression of perfection by calling circumcision "mutilation", since he objects to it as a boundary mark of election to holiness.[38] He thus objects

---

[36] The best translation of ἰσχύω is "give/have power", cf Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.263, and note 94. This translation sets the contrast correctly in relation to Christ.
For different translations to ἰσχύω, see e.g.Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.234: "gelten"; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.352: "wert haben"; Joachim Rohde, *An die Galater*, 1988, p.218: "wirksam sein"; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.228: "have value". One problem is that the parallel powers of the Spirit and circumcision is not commented on, but see Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.719.
Another problem is that these commentators oppose circumcision to faith and relate both to salvation. Thereby they arrive at an interpretation that overlooks that circumcision creates a borderline that divides humanity in two, the perfect and holy as opposed to the unclean and excluded which then causes social differences to be significant.

[37] Against the background of Lev 21,20 and Deut 23,3 circumcision equals mutilation. In 11QTemple 45,12-14 bodily defects are read as reasons for excluding people from the temple and city, which in reality means from Israel; Paul turns the law on its head so that circumcision is rejected as a perverted act which brings exclusion instead of inclusion. See Jerome H. Neyrey, *CBQ* 50, 1988, p.72-100, esp. p.83.
Further, Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.245.
Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.270, sees no more than a caricature in this remark but this seems to be an understatement when the remark is seen in its context.

[38] Most commentators see in this a sarcastic attack on Judaizers for their practising circumcision to gain access to God, see e.g. Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1921, 1964, p.289; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.363-4; Joachim Rohde, *An die Galater*, 1988, p.224-5; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.234.
However, it is important to acknowledge the link to slavery and freedom, and to see that these principles are related to life-style, to circumcision as this introduces one to a life of ritual perfection or holiness in a closed community as opposed to the whole complex of baptism, faith, confession, Spirit as this leads to a life by the Spirit visible in love.

to a theology that makes circumcision into a mark distinguishing between those who have access to salvation and those who are excluded. In Paul's theology the Spirit is the sign of holiness and election, cf. Gal 3,2-5.14. Moreover, it is a universal sign, cf. Gal 4,6.[39] But Paul only rejects circumcision in its function of conveying perfection, not the rite as such.[40] Because he has defined belonging in christo-centric terms, he cannot accept the division caused by circumcision when used as a qualification mark. Because identity is a matter of having a child relationship to God, God-given through faith in Jesus Christ (4,1-7), and of being ἐν Χριστῷ (cf. 3,26-28 and 5,6), the cross now serves as symbol of this identity. There is only one conclusion to draw: that in Christ humanity is not divided by such boundaries that are human symbols of holiness. What is important is the Spirit, the boundary mark that is visible in love, the fruit of the Spirit.[41] Consequently neither being circumcised nor being uncircumcised is significant (Gal 3,28; 6,15).

Secondly, Galatians 6,13-15. In this passage Paul sums up his attack on circumcision by stating that the rite is not important, suggesting instead "new creation" as the theological frame of reference.[42] Another important point is Paul's statement that the cross is the only possible reason for "boasting".[43] By contrasting cross to circumcision Paul refers not simply to

---

[39] Cf. Rom 8,15.

[40] Most obvious in 5,2, interpreted by Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p 156: "Nicht die Tatsache des Beschnittenseins trennt von Christus, wohl aber die Annahme der Beschneidung in statu confessionis."

[41] Cf. Gal 5,22-26.

[42] "Creation" is not the act of creation, but a state or condition of life according to Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.282; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.415, stresses that both circumcision and uncircumcision belong to the past, while new creation has its validity from the present and its origin in baptism; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.296, interprets "new creation" as effected by that which God has done "in Christ" and "by the Spirit", which then means that external expressions, including cultic rituals, are culturally based, therefore secondary. He does not relate "new creation" to baptism. The problem with this interpretation is that it presupposes that Judaizers argued for a nomism while the possibility of theology of perfection as goal of creation is not considered. An alternative is offered by Joachim Rohde, *An die Galater*, 1988, p.277, who interprets κτίσις as new "creature" and in relation to baptism with reference to Eph 2,10.15; Col 3,10 and 2 Cor 4,14, but this seems too narrow a reading.
For E.P. Sanders, *Paul*, 1977, p.468, the phrase refers to either a proleptic or incomplete presence of the new creation.

[43] The translation of καυχᾶσθαι in Gal 6,14, is either "boast", as F.F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 1982, p.267; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.302; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.292; or "glory", as Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.263; Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1921, 1964, p.347.

human pride, but rather to a pride that is grounded in circumcision as rite of perfection, claiming a superior status thereby.[44] Since the cross is the only object for καυχάομαι, circumcision in its function to lead to perfection has been rejected (cf. Phil 3,18-21).[45] For Paul the reason is that the whole relationship with God is at stake when a ritual response rather than the divine initiative is the basis for "boasting". By rejecting the relation between perfection and circumcision, Paul rejects circumcision, both its validity as covenant affirmation and its function in bringing perfection or holiness.[46] When the completion or restoration of creation is in and through the cross, God's creative power visible in the Christ event is opposed to circumcision as sign of restoration. For Paul theology and not simply practice is at issue: Circumcision can no longer be the foundation for a relationship with God since that foundation is the Christ event. And since the cross and the resurrection alone are the basis for hope of the resurrection of humanity, circumcision can no longer function as sign of hope, limited as it is in scope and power.

Finally, it may be possible to see the aspect of perfection behind Paul's attack on circumcision in Romans 4,9-12, although this is not often noted.[47] By drawing on the Abraham tradition Paul interprets Abraham as father of both Jews and Gentiles, circumcised and uncircumcised.[48] Unlike Galatians 3-4

The German commentaries all translate into: "rühmen".
The context decides whether there is a right or a wrong cause for "boasting".
The object (greek construction: ἐν with dative) of καυχάομαι clearly sets the cross in contrast to circumcision. For similar constructions, e.g. 2 Cor 12,9; Rom 5,3; 1 Cor 1,31; 2 Cor 10,17 and 1 Cor 3,21, cf. Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.413.

[44] For a different interpretation, see Peder Borgen, in *Paul and Paulinism*, 1980, p.40, who interprets circumcision in Galatians in the light of Philo as a rite for removal of passions, a function which he then thinks has been replaced by the cross.

[45] Although σταυρός, σταυρόω are used only a few times in Pauline letters, the link to universal salvation is significant. Cf. 1 Cor 1,13.23; 2,2.8; Eph 2,16; Phil 2,8; 3,18; Col 1,20; 2,14. Cf. also Rom 5,18 and 2 Cor 5,17.

[46] Whether there is any allusion to the cross as sacrifice replacing circumcision as a sacrifice is difficult to determine from Galatians. Later Pauline texts like Colossians and Ephesians need to be considered, but the soteriological interpretation falls outside the scope of this study. See Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.719, for the use of "blood of circumcision" and atonement in rabbinic literature.

[47] But see Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.219 who makes the point that only a circumcision of hearts conveys perfection.

[48] By using the phrase "inherit the world" in the following passage, 4,13-15, Paul introduces a universal perspective to identity, also found in the quotation in v.18 "father of many nations". The purpose is to show that both Jews and Gentiles are children of Abraham, that they share ancestry.
While it is true that the promise of land is transferred to universal

in which Paul deals with the status of the inheritors, Romans 4 deals primarily with the identity of Abraham as father, stressing his state of righteousness before circumcision.[49] Only indirectly is the identity of the children addressed when the boundary is established as one defined by faith.[50] By using Abraham as model of trust and faith based on Gen 15 Paul reassesses circumcision and rejects it as a rite of identification for both Jews and Gentiles.[51] Instead he points to righteousness through faith as opposed to obedience, presupposing a knowledge of Gen 17,9-14, but not commenting on God's demand to circumcise.[52] In contrast to most writers within a Jewish background, Paul stresses that Abraham's qualifications originated prior to his circumcision.[53] From this he deduces that circumcision gives no special quality, which makes best sense if perfection is in mind. While circumcision is called a "seal", *σφραγίς*,[54] it is not, as in Gen

---

salvation as seen by Jacob Jervell in *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.72, it is, from the perspective of identity, more a question of widening the boundaries and include Gentiles in the promise involved with becoming a people.

[49] Identity is the past identity that derives from a father; yet in this case it is not strictly a narrow family identity, rather identity has been broadened to include two groups, those of circumcision and those of uncircumcision. Note that they are <u>not</u> designated "children", *τέκνα*, as in Galatians, but "seed", or "offspring", *σπέρμα*, cf. 4,13.16.18, which in 1,3 is used christologically.
Hence I find that James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* I, 1988, p.233, overinterprets this point.

[50] Better nuanced, Ibid., p.211: "it is faith like Abraham's which determines Abraham's fatherhood and the sonship of Abraham."

[51] See Halvor Moxnes in a comment to Rom 4,16-18 in *Theology*, 1980, p.250: "Paul asks his Jewish readers that they accept a complete change of religious identity, and consequently, adopt a new understanding of God. These are the implications when Paul relates 'God who makes life to the dead' in the same way to 'all the offspring of Abraham', both Jews and non-Jews."

[52] See Klaus Berger, *MThZ* 17, 1966, p.68.
Since Paul has declared in Rom 3,9-10, that righteousness is through faith, not by means of circumcision, circumcision no longer has the same value (cf. Rom 2,25-29), see also Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.720.

[53] For stressing an affinity to Rabbinic exegetical principles, see e.g. Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.108; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.233; Sigfred Pedersen, *Kompendium*, 1985, p.16-17; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.207-9.

[54] See the classic study by G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal*, 1967, esp. p.7-18, suggesting that "marking of ownership" is a helpful interpretation.
See also the various commentaries on this.
Thus Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.71, notes that seal is used metaphorically of God's confirmation related to a promise of becoming righteous, not a sign demanding piety.
Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.108-9, suggests, in reference to Sanday-Headlam, that there may be a technical use to seal, which he then relates to baptism, cf 2 Cor 1,22; Eph 1,13 and 4,30. (This has been suggested already by A.von Stromberg, *Studien*, 1913, p.98, with

17,11 and Jub 15,13, the "sign of the covenant", σημεῖον διαθήκης.[55] Instead the qualification is "righteousness through faith". This shows clearly that Paul reinterprets circumcision, relating it to boundaries set by God, "seal" being a sign of God's affirmation, and therefore best understood as a God-given mark parallel to the gift of the Spirit, cf. 2 Cor 1,22. Eph 1,13.[56] What Paul objects to is this: If circumcision becomes a sign of perfection, it builds no longer on promise but on the human law as the leading principle, which makes it mark a false boundary for a new Christian identity. In short, Paul's overall theology, with justification as divine gift and view of God as the power which raised Jesus (Rom 4,24), force him to devalue circumcision when used falsely. As obligatory rite it conveys no particular power to reach perfection or justification.

(3) In regard to maintaining cultic purity I suggested that circumcision was set aside for other purity rites.[57] It cannot occasion surprise that there is no trace in the Pauline material of circumcision as a cultic boundary. Although its capacity to be a rite of consecration may be presupposed, neither Paul nor his readers seem to relate circumcision to consecration.[58] Thus there are no arguments for a need to maintain circumcision to gain access to the temple. This proves nothing, since this function may be self-

---

documentation from patristic writers.). Another nuance is the juridical which in a context of faith means faith is made legitimate by seal.
C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.236, sees the seal as "the outward and visible authentication, ratification and guarantee, of the righteousness by faith." The seal attests to status while not conferring it.
James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, denies that seal refers to baptism. Instead he takes seal as a reference to the gift of the Spirit, p, 209-210.

[55] As noted by William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *Romans*, 1920, p.106. "Seal" for the gift of the Spirit has an eschatological connotation and is used in contrast to circumcision as covenant sign, as observed by G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.175. While he is correct inasmuch as he sees a clear contrast, he fails to qualify circumcision as a God-given sign for covenant validity, of theological significance and social importance, which then can be contrasted to an eschatological sign.

[56] See James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* I, 1988, p.211.
An alternative view is that of G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal*, 1967, p.91, who sees a parallel between circumcision and water baptism ("the only rite signifying Spirit-baptism") both being described as seal ratifications.
The pneumatological connection has been noted by Otto Betz, *TRE* 5, 1980, p.219.

[57] See Chapter Three II (2) (a) and Four II (2) (e).

[58] Note, that the brief reference to the circumcision of Jesus and subsequent presentation in the temple (cf. Luke 2,21) indicates that consecration is an issue in the Lucan community. The act serves to prove that the law has been fulfilled, including cultic laws, thus the to claim legitimacy of Jesus as Messiah for the Jews, see Jacob Jervell, *SEA* 37-38, 1972-73, p.145-155.
Cf. also Acts 21,28 on the accusation against Paul for disregarding temple laws on access for Gentiles.

evident.

(4) It is in line with both Old Testament traditions and Judaism when Paul refers to circumcision as a metaphor for renewal. However, even this needs reinterpretation, because "circumcision of hearts" can, as we have seen, be an image of law observance.[59] If this is the case, law is the leading principle for renewal.

The best illustration of this is Romans 2,25-29. Here Paul argues against both a literal and a spiritual understanding of circumcision, assuming that circumcision places one under an obligation to obey the law.[60] Although this passage is extremely polemical it also offers a positive view of what circumcision is to a Jew, particularly when circumcision is a true circumcision.[61] For the same reason that he is against the "new" covenant when it is based on the principle of law in 2 Corinthians 3, he opposes the idea of circumcision of hearts, since this metaphor suggests renewal with law as principle.[62] And since it is not only outward circumcision but the practice of the entire law that marks a Jew, he rejects this outward mark when it alone is made into a sign of privilege.[63] Circumcision is accepted as true

---

[59] See Chapter One, p.38, and Four II (2) (e).

[60] See e.g. Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.52; Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.68; C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.171; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.194-241.

[61] For this see, Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.68, who takes Paul's argument as an attack on the view that circumcision has a power to save.
C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.171, translates ὠφελεῖ, in 2,25, into "profitable", but NRSV's "of value" is a better choice, because it is less tendentious. He too sees the link between circumcision and salvation, cf. p.172.
James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 1988, p.121, stresses that for Paul "the circumstances of the new age" lead to a different interpretation of the need for circumcision to be included in practice of the law.

[62] See above in Chapter Six (IV).
If one accepts with Halvor Moxnes, *Theology*, 1980, p.62, that Paul in this passage stresses "the immediate connection between God and the law as God's command", and that the attack is on Jews and their entire relationship with God, it means the issue is not simply that one ritual replaces another, rather, the heart of the matter is how to view God, as a God for both Jews and Gentiles, cf. 2,11.

[63] Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.70, believes Paul uses Ἰουδαῖος, as honorary title, but Jacob Jervell, *Gud og hans fiender*, 1973, p.53, observes that elsewhere this is a title used by others. If this is correct, external boundaries, and not boundaries within Israel, are referred to here.
cf. also James D.G. Dunn, *Paulus und das Antike Judentum*, 1991, p.309-12, who sees circumcision as most distinctive identity marker, the focus of distinctiveness and privilege of covenantal belonging in a context in which Paul argues that the gift of the law makes Jews more privileged than Gentiles.

only when it builds on the principle of πνεύμα.[64] Here Paul offers new insight from experience and refers to circumcision in its metaphorical sense, by on the one hand affirming circumcision as metaphor for renewal, and on the other hand, redefining it. By emphasising that circumcision is of the heart and by the Spirit, (v.29: περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι) or rather the experience of the Spirit as liberator, he opposes both a Jewish and a Christian false interpretation of newness and radically reinterprets the circumcision metaphor as an image of the gift of the Spirit.[65] For Paul the Spirit now functions as an ecclesiological boundary mark and as such replaces the law.[66] It is of note that the antithesis between law and Spirit is related to Jewish and Christian identity, inasmuch as one is built on the principle of law, the other on the Spirit as divine gift.[67] Consequently Paul is forced to devalue circumcision, even in its metaphorical sense, and radically reinterpret circumcision of the heart to be an image of the gift of the divine Spirit, as transformation and renewal of both the individual, and the community. Paul also refers to the same image in Col 2,11.[68] Here the "circumcision of Christ"[69] may be interpreted in terms of having received the Spirit as a boundary mark of identification for the body of Christ.[70] As for renewal, this is related to Christ, because

---

[64] Cf. my interpretation of 2 Cor 3,6 in Chapter Six (IV).

[65] Some would interpret "circumcision of hearts" as metaphor for baptism, see e.g. Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.68; Gerhard Delling, *Die Taufe*, 1962, p.122 and Ernst Käsemann, *An die Römer*, 1980, p.70.
C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans* I, 1985, p.175-6, refers to circumcision of hearts as a "miracle, the work of God's Spirit", but does not mention baptism.

[66] The interpretation suggested by James D.G. Dunn, *Romans* I, 1988, p.125.127, that circumcision is an old ethnic boundary which is replaced by circumcision of hearts as an eschatological boundary,I find that is too narrow, because this neglects the visible presence of the Spirit as symbol of a different ecclesiological identity.

[67] The contrast of life and death is not present here, instead Paul operates simply with value.

[68] Cf. G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.152-3.

[69] The problem is whether the genitive qualifying circumcision is subjective or objective. But if baptism is meant by "circumcision of Christ", it is striking that baptism is nowhere called "baptism of Christ", but baptism is always with a preposition, as "in the name of".
For this view see, also Raymund Schwager, *ZKTh* 100, 1978, p.49, who interprets the phrase as a metaphor for the suffering of Christ: "Wäre mit der Beschneidung die Taufe gemeint, hätte der Autor aller Wahrscheinlichkeiten nach von einer *peritome epi Christo (en Christo)* gesprochen.... Die Bezeichnung des Kreuzesgeschehen als eine Beschneidung is um so weniger überraschend, als auch im Markus und Lukas-Evangelium das Kreuzesleiden als einer Taufe bezeichnet wird."

[70] Most commentators will take Col 2,11 as a metaphor for baptism, but it is better to take it as a metaphor for the gift of the Spirit, as in James D.G.Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.153-54.

through the cross God has initiated a new world order, a "new creation" (cf. Gal 6,15). Or it is God's "Yes" to humanity, the gift of the Spirit which means renewal by Spirit, not by law (cf. 2 Cor 1,20-22). And when thus the cross, resurrection and gift of the Spirit are signs of newness, circumcision can, on theological grounds, no longer function as a metaphor for renewal.

In conclusion, when Paul deals with circumcision he draws on its Old Testament aspects. On the one hand, Paul uses terms like, *περιτομή*, *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, and *ἀκροβυστία*, which may indicate no more than a familiarity with recognised terminology cf. Rom 3,30; 4,9; 15,8-9, Gal 2,7-9.12, where he seems to distinguish between two identity groups common in antiquity.[71] Whether there are signs that these terms are used in a pejorative sense is less relevant.[72] The point is that as soon as ethnic and ecclesiological identity is disputed, so is circumcision. When therefore Jewish ethnic identity is opposed to Gentile identity, circumcision functions to mark the difference between a Jew and a Gentile. When relationship with God is based on a christo-centric, not an ethno-centric covenant, circumcision, with its traditional tie to an ethnic covenant and to exclusiveness of election, can no longer serve as an adequate symbol of a vertical relationship. Paul's pneumatological and christological boundaries brings him to claim that the rite of circumcision is of no value, either as a mark of perfection or as a metaphor for renewal. Because the cross is sign of perfect love, circumcision is no longer an adequate rite. Because renewal is related to the experience of the Spirit, circumcision, as a symbol of law and renewal, is no longer appropriate. And because circumcision brings differences into focus, it is declared invalid. In short, when Paul defines Christian identity differently from Jewish identity, he is forced simultaneously to reject circumcision as a Christian identity mark. It is too limited to serve as an entry rite of the vertical covenant relationship when status in relation to God is given as that of a child to parent. Instead a different boundary mark, the Spirit is given. But nowhere does Paul suggest that one rite, circumcision, is replaced by another rite, baptism. Moreover, I

---

[71] Even if Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.97-98 is right, following Erich Dinkler, *Signum Crucis*, 1967, p.270-82, that the "gospel of circumcision" and "of uncircumcision" are non-Pauline notions, possibly referring to an official document, the point to note is that Paul uses this vocabulary in a sense that reflects ethnic boundaries.

[72] Thus Joel Marcus, *NTS* 35, 1989, p.67-81, argues that *περιτομή* and *ἀκροβυστία* are derogatory terms used in a mixed community (Rome) of each other's identity. - It is important to bear in mind that the boundary mark Paul is dealing with in Galatians concerns Gentiles, cf. Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.201; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.44; F.F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 1982, p.269.

conclude that if there were no more than Jewish religious identity at stake, the problem of circumcision of Gentiles could have been solved either by enforcing the demand, or by giving spiritual circumcision preference, thereby emphasising ethical and moral circumcision as opposed to the literal. Since the problem is theological, the definition of boundaries reflects a change in theology of self-understanding for both Jews and Gentiles. The fact that in Christ national, racial, gender, moral and social differences do not apply, makes it necessary for Paul to argue for a replacement on the grounds that circumcision both creates and maintains differences of this type.

III Baptism as Boundary Rite.

In this section I shall focus on Paul's views on Christian identity reflected in baptism as a boundary rite. It matters not whether Paul refers to identity in concrete ecclesiological terms or in metaphorical images.[73] By way of introduction I shall point to the lack of reference to the baptism of Jesus, or the missionary mandate of the resurrected Jesus recounted in the gospels.[74] While this is well-known it raises questions regarding Paul's concern with past identity. It is thus significant that Paul in 1 Corinthians 10 refers to the Exodus event and uses this particular historical setting in an argument where he characterises the people of Israel as "baptised". Two questions emerge from this, Does Paul seek a rationale for baptism in this Old Testament tradition? Or does he give an explanation to what the effect of baptism is? It is further significant that Paul in 1 Corinthians 12 and Galatians 3 uses "baptise" in the same context as he refers to the Spirit as a shared experience. While these texts are well researched from this perspective they nevertheless need to be analysed for the relation between ecclesiological identity and boundaries.Is the community identified by the Spirit or by having baptism in common, or both? While "baptised into the name of" has been given much scholarly attention, such as the difference to other formulaic expressions as in 1 Corinthians 1,

---

[73] These metaphors for identity are the anthropomorphic: a family, children or heirs to the covenant promise, or the cosmological image of a new creation, briefly mentioned in Chapter Six.
I fail to see how Robert Banks, p.82, can conclude that "nowhere ...in Paul's discussions of baptism do we find a hint that baptism has anything to do with church."
If baptism is no more than a sign of a vertical relationship, a commitment to God, the visibility of the rite is, if not meaningless, at least problematic because of the individualistic interpretation inherent in such a view of baptism.

[74] Thus Mark 16,15-16; Matt 28, 19-20. Note that Luke, leaves out the command to baptise in 24,46-49, but includes baptism as self-evident in Acts 2,38.

the issue of identification by means of undergoing a ritual needs to be addressed also. In short, the overall question is whether Paul sees baptism as a boundary of the Christian community or as a ritual by means of which identity is changed and hence as a rite of entry to the church.

The terms *βαπτίζειν* and *βάπτισμα* are suggested by the Septuagint's translation of טבל which means "to remove of ritual impurity".[75] Its use in the New Testament should be seen against its absence from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[76] The question is whether the preference New Testament writers give to *βαπτίζειν* as opposed to *ἁγνίζειν*,[77] "to purify" or "to sanctify", points to the pattern of changed identity or is of no significance.

It is scholarly consensus that Paul refers to baptism as a self-evident rite albeit only in passing; the majority takes "to baptise" in all contexts literally to refer to a rite in which water is used as instrument and symbol, while a minority argues for a metaphorical meaning for some of the texts.[78] It seems that Paul by using the verb, *βαπτίζειν*, only 13 times in the genuine letters, and the noun, *βάπτισμα*, only in Rom 6,4, and in the disputed letters, Eph 4,5 and Col 2,12, refers to well-known ritual.[79] Two

---

[75] The more common form is *βάπτειν* "to dip". On the LXX usage, see e.g. Albrecht Oepke, *ThWNT* I, 1933, p.527-44. esp. p.533.
Note, that while in Exod 14,22 the people passes through the sea on dry ground, there is no use of baptismal terms; when re-enacting the Red Sea crossing under Joshua, Jos 3,15, the feet of the priests were dipped (*ἐβάφησαν*) in the event of crossing the Jordan. The motif of liberation is repeated, not renewed, and unless the change in vocabulary is significant both stories contain "dipping" as part of the crossing. And while 2 Kings 5,14 testifies to a rare usage inasmuch as *βαπτίζειν* means "immerse oneself", cf. Jud 12,7, it is doubtful whether this terminology has an impact on Paul. Nevertheless scholars find this is evidence for the existence of a Jewish ritual which influenced both proselyte baptism and Christian baptism, but when Luke refers to this incident, Luke 4,27, the issue is cleansing.

[76] Above, Chapter Four, note 85, I noted the absence of טבל as term for purification in 1QS. Thus 1QS 3,6-9 preferred טהר and כפר to טבל.

[77] Used e.g. in Exod 19,10; in the New Testament only in John 11,55; Acts 21,24.26; 24,18; James 4,8; 1 Pet 1,22; 1 John 3,3.

[78] For instance in regard to Gal 3,27 and 1 Cor 12,13. For a majority view on 1 Cor 12,13, see e.g. W.F. Flemington, *Baptism*, 1953, p.56; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.167; Erich Dinkler, *Die Taufaussagen*, 1971, p.87; Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.104; Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 1983, p.141.
For the alternative view see above all James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.109. 128, followed by Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.606.

[79] The occurrences of *βαπτίζειν* are: twice in Romans (6,3); ten times in 1 Corinthians (1,13-17; 10,2; 12,13; 15,29) and once in Galatians (3,27).
The verb is either in active or in passive, constructed either with an instrumental *ἐν*, or with *εἰς* which designates a movement related to a) place, b) time, c) number, or d) purpose, cf. William W. Goodwin: A Greek Grammar, London 1977, § 1207.

things are implied: that Paul accepts a practice of the local communities or it would be meaningless to argue from it ; and that he assumes they have undergone baptism or it would be meaningless to refer to that experience as the foundation of unity. This is true when he addresses both the Christian churches he had founded, as in Galatia or Corinth; and the church in Rome, which he did not found.

A number of texts could be suggested, but the most important here are: (1) 1 Corinthians 1,10-17; (2) 1 Corinthians 10,2; (3) 1 Corinthians 12,13 and (4) Galatians 3.27. Thus, 1 Cor 1,10-17 is part of the first section of the letter running from 1,10-4,21.[80] The background for Paul's argument here is that of a community in conflict.[81] Clearly, Paul has heard of a quarrel in the community (cf. 1,11). If the dispute referred to is an issue of authority and jurisdiction, it is also a disagreement about with whom to identify.[82] 1 Cor 10,2 is part of the passage 10,1-22 which belongs to a section consisting of chapters 8,1-11,1.[83] This can be divided into three sub-sections: 1) 10,2-5 a Midrash on Exodus;[84] 2) 10,6-13 a warning against false security and 3) 10,14-22 an admonition against idolatry. In 10,1 Paul

---

[80] There is a general consensus that this section is a unity and deals with the unity of the body of Christ and that Paul in the opening section deals with the most burning problem of the Corinthian community, see e.g. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther,* 1969, p.44; C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians,* 1976, p.40-119; Wolfgang Schrage, *An die Korinther,* 1991, p.129-32.
Alternatively, 1,10-6,21 is a unity, cf. Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians,* 1987, 1991, p.46-51.

[81] Paul's use of σχίσμα in 1,10 is a neutral designation for divisions; there is no sign of any group breaking away from the community as such. Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther,* 1969, p.45-46.
In the context of 1 Corinthians the question of division emerges at several points, especially in 11 in a context of the shared supper. For a study of the social context of the divisions, see Gerd Theissen, in *Studien,* 1979, p.272-89.
The main issue may be, as Wolfgang Schrage, *An die Korinther,* 1991, p.139, says: "Fehldeutung des Evangeliums im Sinne der Weisheitsorientierung."

[82] For authority, see e.g. C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians,* 1976, p.41.47; Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians,* 1987, 1991, p.50.

[83] There is a general consensus that 8,1-11,1 is a unity. While the sub-division may differ, I suggest four issues 1) food sacrificed to idols in 8,1-13, 2) the freedom of an apostle in 9,1-27, 3) false security in 10,1-22 and 4) the limits of freedom, 10,23-11,1. See the various commentaries, e.g. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther,* 1969, p. 162-212; C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians,* 1976, p.187-246; Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief,* 1982, p.1-64; Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians,* 1987, 1991, p.357-491.
An alternative view is given by Johannes Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief,* 1910, p.212, who contested the unity of the letter; and recently Lamar Cope, *Angl Theol Rev, Suppl. Ser.* 11, 1990, p.114-23, has argued that 10,1-22 is an interpolation to introduce an "anti-temple worship position a generation later" (p.123).

[84] Already Johannes Weiß, Ibid., p.250, but now generally accepted.

begins with the formula-like expression,[85] "I do not want you to be unaware", by means of which he introduces his parenesis on the episode of crossing The Red Sea by seeing this as a parallel experience of liberation to that of the Christian community. Baptism and eucharist (10,1-5) serve as signs of liberation. 1 Cor 12,13 is part of the section 11,2-14,40.[86] This section deals with order, especially related to Christian worship and spiritual gifts, *χαρισμάτα*; 12,13 occurs in the middle of 12,4-31, a passage on unity and diversity of the church, an issue Paul illustrates with the image of the one body.[87] Paul opens in 12,1 with the key word, *πνευματικός*, and leads on to 13, on *ἀγάπη*; and 14 on spiritual gifts manifest as tongues and prophecy. In this context baptism as incorporation is Paul's concern. Finally, Gal 3,27 occurs in the context of 3,1-5,12.[88] If 3,29 is the climactic conclusion to 3,[89] a passage in which identity is defined as being in a child relationship, 3,26-27 may be best approached from the perspective of changed identity.

As a corollary to the conclusion in II above, I shall ask the questions, To what degree is baptism a ritual boundary? Does it stand for initiation? Does it mark a transition? A change of status? A change of belief? First, If baptism functions as a rite of identification, does this mean it is a boundary mark?

(1) Baptism: A Ritual of Identification. 1 Corinthians 1,10-17.

1 Cor 1,10-17 is the clearest example of baptism as a ritual of identification. Since baptism is introduced ironically as baptism "into the name of Paul" the dispute may perhaps better be characterised as one about a true and a false ritual of identification. The context raises the questions: Is the cause of the Corinthian factionalism that groups within the community identified themselves with particular authority figures who had baptised them, giving rise to disputes over identity and jurisdiction? Or is it common knowledge between Paul and his readers, which he addresses by a call to unity, pointing to baptism as a theological reason for unity? If the problem is, as the setting indicates, lack of unity, then the group

---

[85] Cf. the formula in Rom 1,13; 11,25; 2 Cor 1,8.

[86] See e.g. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther*, 1969, p. 212-91; C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.246-334; Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.65-146. An alternative division of 7,1-16,12, is suggested by Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.266-7.

[87] Thus Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther*, 1969, p.244-54; C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.281-297; Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.107. Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.582-83.

[88] See Chapter Six III for this and for the relevant references.

[89] See above p.221.

boundaries within the Corinthian community needed to be dealt with. The question is, Is the reason for this that baptism is misunderstood? Is baptism part of Paul's solution, not the problem?

By beginning the letter with an exhortation and by addressing the whole community, Paul comments on their schism, as this affects the whole church.[90] Thus, unity is clearly his concern when he calls on the authority of "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ", refers to a number of individuals, as if they were figures of authority, and asks whether Christ is divided. And when he asks sarcastically whether they were baptised in the name of Paul, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε, adding his own name in the genitive to qualify baptism, he asks a rhetorical question as to the real basis for unity.[91] Moreover, the mere fact that he can make such a remark shows, first of all, that baptism exists as a rite within the community;[92] secondly, that it is connected with the name of Jesus, either as a confession of faith in Christ, or as a liturgical baptismal formula, or both.[93] But since no more than a hint of this rite is given, the problem cannot be liturgical practice.[94]

The way Paul refers in genitive constructions to himself, Apollos, Cephas and Christ in 1,12, clearly indicates that the problem is person-related, that the unity of the church is threatened by individuals who have created groups and designated themselves accordingly.[95] If groups were formed by individuals who by joining identified themselves over against other groups, or saw themselves in a disciple relationship with one of the above-mentioned

---

[90] The passage is introduced with παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, and the call for unity is addressed to "all", πάντες (v.10).

[91] For the point of irony, see Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981,p.44.

[92] Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.117.

[93] If it was not a generally accepted practice it would not be suitable for Paul's reasoning.

[94] The discussion on whether the formula "in the name of" has a semitic background, or has a parallel in a hellenistic commercial setting, is less important in the context of this study. For a discussion, see most recently Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.44-59.
The important point according to Lars Hartman, *NTS* 20, 1974, p.432-40, is that the formula points to different baptisms, either development in time, e.g. John the Baptist's rite over against a Christian baptism, or to a dissociation from a different content, such as lack of belief in Jesus as Messiah over against a confession to Jesus as Messiah.

[95] Thus ἐγὼ εἰμι with a possessive genitive, of belonging, is almost like a formula, cf. 1,12-13.
Note, that ἐγὼ εἰμι is first singular, denoting that belonging is an individual matter, and contrary to this Paul's response, e.g. 3,9, has plural, ἐσμεν, ἐστε, to express a collective belonging, as a contrast to the individual attitude of the Corinthian Christians.
The contrast between human loyalty and loyalty to Christ seems to be in the background when Paul uses the genitives.

persons, or affirmed their own particular group's status in relation to a leading figure, this would reflect a schismatic situation. Moreover, it would reflect tensions created by clear group boundaries within the church.[96] The genitive constructions interpreted as belonging to one or more groups need not be discussed since the problem is dealt with in general terms of unity, not person related.[97]

Moreover, the groups are not necessarily associated with the baptising activity, although Paul refers to his own lack of involvement in such activity in 1,13-14.[98] The group divisions are conceivable without baptism as part of the problem, since sociological, doctrinal or ethical disputes are all potential causes of disunity, and rituals can serve as unifying factors.[99] Whether baptism was the problem or not, it is significant that Paul's appeal is not to change their baptismal practice, nor does his appeal contain an explanation of what baptism means. Rather he appeals to unity on the level of a profound concern for the community; hence the call to the

---

[96] Note the contrast between v.10, *πάντες* and v. 13, *ἕκαστος*, cf. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther,* 1969, p.46, which emphasizes the individual's position in relation to and within the community.
Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit,* 1983, p.138, interprets the groups as an opposition to Paul that advocated an individual understanding of baptism thereby causing divisions in the community.

[97] Either four groups of equal status, or three inferior groups, belonging to Paul, Apollos or Cephas over against a superior belonging to Christ.For the most recent exposition of this problem, see Wolfgang Schrage, *An die Korinther,* 1991, p.142-48, who takes the four groups as parallel groups.
For a similar view see Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit,* 1983, p.136.
C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians,* 1976, p.44-45, argues for three groups, over against "belong to Christ", as a different category, on a different level.
Nils A. Dahl, in *Christian History,* 1967, argues for two groups, an opposition to Paul and a group of followers of Paul, based on the context 1,10-4,21.
Johannes Munck, *DTT* 15, 1952, p.215-33, dismisses the existence of groups altogether, and suggests quarrels only.

[98] Against James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism,* 1970, p.119, who maintains that baptism brought divisions in Corinth. This is further substantiated, p.117-19, for instance by his interpretation of the phrase, *ἐγὼ δὲ Παυλοῦ* in v. 12 which he takes as being the same as "being baptised into the name of Paul", and by thus interpreting baptism as an act of allegiance to those who administered baptism, baptism becomes a threat to unity. Cf. his *Unity,* 1977, p.157.
Wolfgang Schrage, *An die Korinther,* 1991, p.155, suggests that Paul's argument presupposes that none of the persons mentioned in connection with the group divisions had actually baptised any members of the community. If that is the case, then the reference to Paul's baptising activity is a foil to the issue of unity grounded in baptism in the name of Christ. It is the answer to disunity, not the cause of it.

[99] See Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion,* 1991, p.85: "Ritual gives symbolic form to group unity, and participating individuals symbolically affirm their commitment." Cf. p.176: "Religious symbols can represent the unity of the social group and religious rituals can enact that unity."

church to dissolve the different, or even opposed, groups within it. For this purpose baptism becomes part of his argument. So, from the point of view of identity, Paul's concern is a divided identity which he rectifies by invoking the one boundary rite that unites, rather than separates. In short, Paul addresses the conflict with reference to baptism, and he tries to solve the identity question inherent in the conflict by explaining two things, first what baptism refers to and secondly, what it cannot be. This then raises the question, Why is baptism a symbol of unity?

First, the mere fact that Paul can refer to baptism in a community context shows that it is somehow a community rite symbolising shared identity. If Paul, by using aorists, ἐβαπτίσθητε and ἐβάπτισα (v.13-16), can refer to an event in the past, and thereby remind the quarreling Corinthians of this event as a ritual related to identity, the force of the reference lies in what is presupposed in the ironic remark. Thus Paul maintains that if baptism was/is in his name, identity is narrow and boundaries are individually drawn and do not mark belonging to the whole community identified in its oneness. Because baptism was and is in the name of the crucified, undivided Christ, baptismal identity is grounded in Christ, and boundaries function to identify who belong to Christ. Thus, Paul has in this ironic remark indicated that Christian identity is a shared identity, and that baptism is a symbol of oneness, because it is a rite of identification with Christ as foundation.[100] Moreover, by referring to the name of Christ as opposed to other names, he has indicated that there is only one true mark of unity, only one true identification, baptism in the name of Christ. By asking whether they were baptised in the name of Paul, and simultaneously ridiculing such a notion, he rejects false marks and misinterpreted symbols of identification. Whether the falseness is a misunderstood baptism or a spurious authority cannot be ascertained with the information available; besides, what is important for the present study is that the true identity is recognised.

It is not said explicitly, as in Romans 6,3, that participation in the Christ event of death and resurrection takes place symbolically in baptism; only that the crucified Christ is the unifying factor.[101] By using the cross as a foundation for the appeal to unity here, not as a point that can be

---

[100] Unity is necessary because there is only one foundation, Christ, cf. 3,11, 12,12. See for instance Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit,* 1983, p.138.

[101] Cf. 2 Cor 5,15: "He (Christ) died for all, so that those who live might no longer live for themselves." The "no longer" is an important expression, because this testifies to a "once" and a "now", in the context referred to as "old" and "new creation" (v.17).

argued,[102] Paul makes a profound theological statement about baptism. To the Corinthian community threatened by group divisions he maintains: If baptism is in the name of Christ, it functions also as the true symbol of oneness because it is a ritual of identification with the one Christ, the one cross. And if baptism, even in the name of Christ, is not visible as a boundary around the oneness of Christ, and the church, it functions as a false ritual of identification,

Secondly, since Paul also makes the point that he personally has baptised no one, with the exception of Crispos, Gaios and the house of Stephanas (cf. v.14 and 16); he sees his own mandate not as a mandate to baptise, but to preach. Why does Paul admit to administering the rite of baptism to some, and yet emphasises that his own ministry is concerned primarily with preaching, not baptising (1,17)? There are two possible answers: either baptism is less important than missionary preaching; or baptism is important because it serves as mark of identification in an ecclesiological context, as a visible symbol of membership, as a rite by means of which the church constitutes itself as church.

Although it is clear that for Paul proclamation precedes baptism, this does not imply that baptising activity is inferior to preaching.[103] On the one hand, even if Paul gives priority to his own preaching mandate, he justifies the preaching activity theologically, with reference to his status as apostle to the content of his preaching (the cross); and hence to his charisma.[104] He does not reject baptism as such, but rather, as I have argued above, baptism as potentially a false symbol of identity. On the other hand, by accepting baptism as a symbol of unity in 1,10-13 he has accepted baptism, both its practice and its symbolism.While baptism is a symbol of

---

[102] For this extremely important point, see Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit,* 1983, p.138: "Für Paulus ist das Kreuz Christi theologisches Kriterium, er argumentiert nicht über das Kreuz, sondern redet vom Kreuz her."

[103] For a devaluation of baptism, see for instance the commentaries, Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther,* 1949, p.9; Erich Fascher, *An die Korinther,* 1975, p.95; and C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians,* 1976, p.48, who cautiously concludes that there is "at least a relative disparagement of baptism".
Further the monographs by G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism,* 1962, p.180, Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe,* 1981, p.103; James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism,* 1970, p.119, who takes the baptising task, as "the work of man", against preaching, "the instrument of God".
Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit,* 1983, p.138, thinks that maybe Paul has an emphasis on preaching to balance the Corinthians high estimation of baptism, but of that I find no evidence.
For the view that baptising is not devalued, see Johannes Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief,* 1910, p.21; Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, *An die Korinther,* 1965, p.15; Wolfgang Schrage, *An die Korinther,* 1991, p.157.

[104] See Wolfgang Schrage, Ibid., p.157.

true or false identity, it is more than an individual act of commitment, because when it is administered by the community it serves to mark belonging to the church. And if baptism is practised in the local church, it serves either as a rite through which the church constitutes itself, or through which entry into the church and allegiance to the community are expressed. In both cases baptism is not so much a symbol used in a missionary activity as it is a ritual of identification with a group. By means of this an individual's coming to faith and confessing it is marked through crossing an ecclesiological boundary.

Since Paul elsewhere gives priority to his own sending and calling by God (cf. Gal 1,15-17; 2,7; 2 Cor 3,4-6; 4,3-6; 5,18-19), and does so to emphasise that the centre and foundation of the message is the cross, this is a possible explanation here. What Paul indirectly rejects is baptism as an eschatological rite,[105] involving no more than an individual's confession, since an individualistic rite, as practised by John the Baptist, fails to constitute a boundary of identity, let alone to establish a new identity.[106] If baptism is associated with a confession of faith in Christ, it belongs in the context of the Christian community, which confesses that faith. Consequently a baptism that is no more than an individual response to missionary proclamation becomes inconceivable.[107]

Another explanation for Paul playing down his activity as baptiser is found in 3,5-17. This shows that the issue is related to Paul's missionary activity, but not to baptism. By means of the agricultural metaphor in 3,6 Paul describes two different services, planting and watering, and in the process of the argument he refers to God as giver of growth, to the

---

[105] Cf. the baptism practised by John the Baptist in the Jewish context. See above in Chapter Five.

[106] While John's baptism is primarily eschatological and orientated towards a future judgment, baptism in the early Christian community represented by Paul is primarily christologically founded and means of expressing entry to an ecclesiological community defined as the body of Christ.

[107] Cf. Rom 10,9-10 which mentions a confession to Jesus as Lord, and relates confession to salvation and faith. That it should be a baptismal confession is no more than a guess. Cf. Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.133, following Rudolf Bultmann.
See also Wayne Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 1983, p.155, who finds that "the novice most likely" confessed Jesus as Lord, as an appropriate way to mark change of authority, from allegiance to demonic powers to the realm of Christ. Meeks further (p.154-57) speculates on the motif of dying and rising symbolised in the baptismal rite, in the imagery related to clothing and washing, typifying end of old order and restoration to a new status.
Holger Mosbech, in *Talt og Skrevet*, 1941, p.113, in reference to Hausleiter, 1893, distinguishes between a confession to belong to the crucified Messiah, for Jews, and a confession to the one God, for Gentiles.

community as "God's field" and "God's building". This clearly indicates that the church is depicted in terms of growth which does not immediately suggest boundary crossing. It is noteworthy that Paul uses both an aorist, ἐπιστεύσατε, and a present tense in, θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε (v.9), to designate the Corinthians' and his own communal identity, but not how identity was changed.[108] This indicates that although Paul and Apollos are tools for coming to faith, their role as potential baptisers is not even anticipated here. Since the focus on apostolic ministry suggests a vertical relationship, it is only by implication that we can maintain that a purpose of preaching is to proclaim that identity can be changed in baptism. Because the image of growth has no connotations of boundary, or boundary crossing, there is no mention here of a baptismal rite or any other symbol of social boundaries being crossed. Thus in the Corinthian context it seems more important for Paul to explain his own identity in relation to the divine commission than to explain a change of identity and horizontal boundaries.

As a corollary let me add that there are no clear reasons for believing that Paul refers to former identity in 1 Corinthians 1,10-4,21. The nearest reference to former status is found in 1,26, where Paul asks the Corinthians to remember their call, κλῆσις. When writing, "not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth", he seems to be reminding them of their former life, which could allude to their conversion. However, there is neither an explicit reference, nor an allusion, to change brought about through baptism.[109] There is criticism of social differences beneath Paul's sarcasm, when he sees unity endangered and baptismal equality lacking. Perhaps Paul, by stressing what it means to be participators in the power and wisdom of Christ, indirectly refers to the change of status. But if he does, the change to what they are now does not depend on having been baptised.

To sum up. From what Paul says in 1 Cor 1,10-17 we can infer 1) that there was administration of a baptismal rite, including a confession of the name of Christ, 2) that baptism was linked to belonging to Christ and to unity in Christ, 3) that a new status was somehow related to a call from God through Paul's proclamation of the cross, and 4) that if change of status was marked by a baptism, this was simultaneously a rite of initiation into a community identified by its belief in the crucified Jesus Christ. For unknown reasons,

---

[108] Identity is God-given, cf. v.16: "you are God's temple", and 2 Cor 6,16, cf. also the Pauline tradition on church as static building in 1 Pet 2,5.

[109] Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther*, 1969, p.65; Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 1967, p.24.

there is no interest in explaining how this baptism symbolises change, how the ritual was administered, what was the content of the confession, or what the receiving community emphasised. Change of status may be assumed. Rather than confining baptism to the individual sphere of commitment, Paul turns it into a ritual of identification with Christ. Since baptism is the occasion on which the community accepts an individual it is the ritual boundary to a new identity in Christ.

(2) Baptism: A Ritual of Liberation. 1 Corinthians 10,2.

1 Corinthians 10,2 is of special interest because Paul draws on Old Testament traditions: *πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ*, "and all were baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea".[110] Why does Paul refer to the Exodus event as a baptismal experience and what light does his use of scripture throw on baptism?

This particular allusion is to Israel's liberation from slavery, the creation of a people identified by its law and to the covenant promise of land.[111] Although this tradition clearly refers to purification, or sanctification, as a prerequisite condition for the encounter with God (Exod 14,29-31), this aspect does not seem to be in Paul's mind.[112] It is even possible that Paul understands crossing in a transferred sense to mean crossing the sea of death to enter salvation.[113]

The unique phrase "baptised to Moses" *εἰς Μωϋσῆν*, could mean two things according to interpreters: A minority suggests that Paul refers to a Jewish prototype of Christian baptism;[114] more common is the view that the phrase is

---

[110] This follows Nestle-Aland 26th ed. Earlier editions had *ἐβαπτίσαντο*. See also Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 1975, p.559.

[111] The crossing of the Red Sea is received by the writer of Joshua as a pattern to be repeated in the crossing of Jordan (Jos 3,14-4,7). See, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes*, 1989, p.101, who makes the point that Paul uses a contrasting strategy in 1 Corinthians 10, by identifying Christ with the rock, not with Moses.

[112] Note the lack of reference to purification in Exod 19,10.14, cf.Chapter One, p.30. It is less obvious whether there is an allusion to Jos 3,15, cf. above note 75.

[113] As indicated in Exod 14,30.
Thus suggested by Per Lundberg, *La typologie*, 1942, p.142-44, with reference to Rev 15,2 and rabbinic exegesis. For the latter see also Stack-Billerbeck, vol III, p.405-6.

[114] See e.g Wilhelm Bousset, *An die Korinther*, 1917, p.118, who states that Israel went through a kind of baptism. Cf. also Holger Mosbech, *Første Korinthierbrev*, 1931, p. 136-37; Jean Héring, *The First Epistle*, 1962, p.85-86; Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 1967, p.200 (cf. the translation on p.198: "all pledged themselves to trust in Moses".)
This interpretation is possible only when the middle, *ἐβαπτίσαντο*, is used,

analogous to "in the name of Jesus".[115] In the latter case "baptised to Moses" is created from "baptised to Jesus", so that Exodus functions as prophecy. In the former, "baptised to Moses" is a way of identifying jurisdiction; but an allusion to opponents' views similar to those of 1,10-17 cannot be excluded.[116] Whatever Paul sees as problem, ecclesiology is part of his answer.[117] Thus, in recalling the Exodus from a Christian perspective of identity, Paul stresses two points: continuity with the past and orientation towards the future.

First, Paul points to the element of continuity in the expression, *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν*.[118] This refers to identity that builds on historical roots so that argument mixes a former example with a warning to the contemporary community.[119] Validity hinges on the pronoun, *ἡμῶν*, as an inclusive expression, and his use of *πάντες*.[120] In this there is an inclusiveness that is parallel to Gal 3,26.28 and 1 Cor 12,13 but also contrasts to being an individual, *ἕκαστος*, in 1 Cor 1,12. Against the background of 1 Cor 1,12-17 Paul seems to argue against factions, here also using *πάντες* to sum up the all-embracing nature of belonging. By paralleling the Exodus community to the Christian he can suggest that both have liberation in common. By viewing the Exodus as an experience of the whole people he can assume a corporate identity for both. Moreover, by using Christ as foundation he can forcefully

---

since this has connotations of "baptising oneself", cf Albrecht Oepke, *ThWNT* I, 1933, p.533.
A variant is Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.49, who thinks Paul uses the Exodus baptism as a "prototype" to illustrate the difference between the two, in the first God is active, in the second human response is needed, which is an over-interpretation.

[115] See e.g. C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.221; Gordon D.Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.445, and James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.126.

[116] Cf. Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.41.

[117] For a cautious position see, G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.185, who emphasises a dual recognition of the people of God, stressing God's activity in both instances without pressing the point.

[118] C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.220, finds this expression problematic in a Gentile setting, but then he does not seem to acknowledge that tradition and scripture are important factors also in the redefinition of self-understanding.
Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.40, sees the point of comparison in the salvation that has the effect of constituting the people of God.
Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.444, notes this as evidence of the church's familiarity with the Old Testament and its true continuity with the past.

[119] See Lars Hartman, *Auf den Namen*, 1992, p.90.

[120] Hans Conzelmann, *An die Korinther*, 1969, p.194, points to the recurring use and interprets *πάντες* in collective terms.
Against Gordon D. Fee in *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.444, note 15, who thinks the recurring use stresses "the enormity of their corporate sin".

interpret a tradition even to the point where two baptisms are parallel in their function as boundary rites, since they both mark crossings into liberation.[121] Somewhat surprisingly the aspect of entry is left out.

While discontinuity could have been expressed by designating the people "new", the notion is missing, and not even alluded to.[122] Rather the force of Paul's argument is, that God is the same God then and now, God as judge and as mercy.[123] The difference (between what is termed "baptised to Moses" and what elsewhere is called "baptised to Christ") is ecclesiological.[124] God's relation with humanity has changed, therefore identity is widened, and boundaries differ. If the reading ἐβαπτίσαντο is correct,[125] this is a way in which Paul can indicate a difference between exclusive and inclusive identity.[126] Moreover, he can indicate that if baptism is falsely understood as a guarantee of salvation, the eschatological judgment of the Christian church will be more severe than the death the Exodus people experienced.[127] Paul does not compare Israel with the Christian community, he compares the two experiences of liberation.[128] Thus, from scripture he argues for having

---

[121] For stressing a christo-centric hermeneutic see James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970. p.126-27.
Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 1983, p.155, has a fine observation: "Paulus hat ein Interesse daran, die Taufe ins AT zurückzuverlegen um sie dann aus dem AT ableiten zu können."
The "ecclesiocentric hermeneutic" offered by Richard B. Hays, *Echoes*, 1989, p.99-102, is worth considering, if it is not an alternative but a supplement to the christo-centric reading.

[122] Against e.g. W.F. Flemington, *Baptism*, 1953, p.54; Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 1983, p.155; Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.444, who states:"God's new people are the true Israel of God, who fulfill his promises made to the father", This misses Paul's point here.
Johannes Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 1910, p.249, is more cautious and counts "our fathers" among Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

[123] Against Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.49, who takes the Read Sea crossing as a prototype, by means of which Paul shows that in the first incident God is active, in the second, people must respond. This then is turned into an argument on the necessity of faith, as a criterion that refers to election (p.50).

[124] Not simply as Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.55, stresses when he takes "baptism to Moses" to have its force when it is understood as a dissociation, but rather as a change in identity reflected in the rite.

[125] Arguments for this in C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.220-21.
For the preference to passive see, Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 1975, p.559.

[126] See Richard L. Jeske, in *Kirche*, 1980, p.248.

[127] Cf. Hans Halter, *Taufe*, 1976, p.161-2.

[128] Cf. Hans Halter, Ibid., p.158, who also points to another parallel, the Spirit, present for the Exodus people in the cloud, and for the church in a variety of way, including baptism.
An alternative view is that of Beasly-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.183, who dismisses this because it would imply a baptism in Spirit before a water

liberation in common, using Israel's disobedience to draw ethical, but not ritual boundaries. The point that Israel suffered because of its apostasy and lack of ethics, is used as a warning against false security, v.12. The story of Israel being saved by God's mercy is used to give hope in a community divided by a false and a true identity. By creating a link between ecclesiology and eschatology, Paul demonstrates that identity is formed by both a past and a future. While self-understanding may change, the two communities still have liberation in common.

Secondly, by alluding to the Exodus Paul indicates that identity has a future dimension. There is no emphasis on liberation as an effect of baptism.[129] Rather liberation is a divine gift which can be turned into slavery, cf. v.5-11.[130] Unlike 1 Cor 1 where Paul refers to the cross as foundation, 1 Cor 10 has no such reference.[131] As in Galatians 4, where Paul argues for two simultaneous covenants, in 10,4 he indicates that Christ is present in both communities by identifying ἡ πέτρα and ὁ Χριστός. The result is that both communities may experience liberation through Christ. The relation between the two is "one of positive correspondence, not antithesis".[132] From an eschatological point of view both are object of God's judgment, and from an ecclesiological point of view both have a future salvation as a promised goal.

To sum up. Because the Midrash leads into a warning against apostasy, Paul's interpretation of the Exodus should be seen with this in view. When this text is read with liberation as central theme it functions to encourage baptised Christians and to warn them against an idolatry similar to Israel's. The most important conclusion is that the baptismal crossings are parallel inasmuch as both are rites of liberation. Paul uses the story to remind his readers of the ethical consequenses of identity and boundaries, not to argue for two covenants or for baptism as entry into the covenant. Nor does he assume that Christian baptism is superior to a Jewish rite. Rather the two baptisms correspond to each other, both express liberation.

---

baptism.

[129] See rightly James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.127.

[130] The slavery in mind is that of submission to false gods, cf. Exod 32.

[131] See above in (1).

[132] Thus Richard B. Hays, *Echoes*, 1989, p.97. And he continues: "Nowhere in the text is there a hint of a claim that the church stands in some relation of superiority to the wilderness generation, or that the church has superseded Israel. Indeed, such notions would undermine precisely the point that the typology is designed to serve."

(3) Baptism: A Ritual of Incorporation. 1 Corinthians 12,13.

1 Corinthians 12,13 gives another example of Paul's use of "baptise". The immediate contextual background is in 12,12, a comparative clause[133] in which we find the image of the human body, one organism yet consisting of many "limbs and organs".[134] This image of the body is both an ecclesiological metaphor and as such it refers to the oneness of Christ.[135] The idea of the one body consisting of diverse parts is further elaborated in v.13, stating: *καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἕν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύτεροι, καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν*, "prompted by the one Spirit, we were all baptised into one body- Jews or Greek, slaves or free- and we were all made to drink of one Spirit".[136]

As in 1,10-14, the main problem here is unity. Although Paul's metaphor suggests an ecclesiological identity, the church as the one body of Christ, the problem is that it does not reflect boundaries. "Entry into" belongs to a different category of imagery. If the identity issue is unity imaged as body, the boundary issue is one of incorporation.[137]

---

[133] *καθάπερ* is here followed by *οὕτως*.

[134] REV.

[135] What is expected after the body metaphor is a comparison with the community, but instead Paul says Christ.
Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.107, points to the narrow connection between v.12, because of the *γάρ*, and v. 11, which contains the idea that the one Spirit puts the diverse charismata in operation. Also v.13 has the Spirit as the central issue. In consequence, when Paul speaks of Christ he draws attention to God who sends the Spirit (cf. 2 Cor 1,22; 5,5).

[136] My translation.
I interpret *ἐν* as denoting cause; this is suggested by the many references to the Spirit as instrument in the previous passage. Thus 1 Cor 12,3 contains both *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ* and *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*; 12,4 has, *τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα*; 12,7, *φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος*, is explained in v. 8-9 with four references to the Spirit; and in 12,11, the different charismata assigned to the Spirit are summed up in the phrase, *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἕν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα*.
It is parallel to the idea expressed in Rom 8,13-15 and Gal 4, 1-6 which can be paraphrased, having received the Spirit in our hearts we cry and utter a confession to God as father; if we possess the Spirit we also know that we are children of God. See further, the datives in Gal 5,16.25, of a life guided by the Spirit.
The advantage of this interpretation, that the Spirit is the instrument that causes a person to confess and undergo a baptism, is that it shows that baptism functions as ritual response in a community that sees itself as identified by the presence of the Spirit.
Cf. Johannes Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 1910, p.303, who suggests the translation, "von einem Geiste umfasst, sind wir alle zu einem Leibe getauft worden". By choosing "enclosed in the Spirit" he indicates that this is a counterpart to "made to drink of one Spirit".

[137] What is important is not the background and its use of the metaphor but Paul's reuse, his specific interpretation of the body image in its

It is significant that Paul here stresses that there is a variety of functions, all related to the community as body, all necessary, for its well-being, its existence and its growth.[138] Simultaneously he stresses the significance of being one body. How does Paul address baptismal boundaries in this context? Is "baptised" perhaps not meant literally, but used metaphorically?

This last question on metaphor needs to be answered first. If the reference to having been baptised is a metaphor, what does it refer to? The most obvious answer is that "baptised" is a metaphor for receiving the Spirit because of the emphasis on Spirit.[139] The ... Spirit stands in an emphatic position in 12,13. Thus Spirit is used twice, and placed first, at the start of the clause to give it prominence, so that ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι is followed by ἐβαπτίσθημεν with εἰς ἕν σῶμα; secondly, the Spirit figures in the end of v.13 in the phrase, ἐποτίσθημεν ἕν πνεῦμα. Noteworthy also is the thrice recurring use of "one": "one Spirit", "one body", "one Spirit". The twice repeated πάντες underlines the breadth, perhaps even the universality, of what is being discussed. But does this mean that a common experience of the Spirit is the unifying factor, so that there is no reference to a rite of baptism?

When "baptised" is interpreted as a metaphor for the gift of the Spirit, this builds on the traditional translation, "baptised in (or by) one Spirit into one body". The problem of this is that it is not acknowledged that there are two images: baptised in/by the Spirit and into the body. If the body is a metaphor serving as an argument for diversity, three expressions of unity seems to be superfluous.[140] And when out of these three, two would seem to express the same idea, this is not contested. Further, if unity is

---

application to a Christian community.
Paul's argument is based on a comparison that takes the starting point in a human body, not the body of Christ, as Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.110, rightly stresses.

[138] Cf. Paul S. Minear, *Images*, 1960, p.192, who sees Paul's concern in 12,28-31, to be with unity and interdependence, and the one body as an image of "absolute solidarity in suffering and glory".

[139] A metaphorical interpretation of 1 Cor 12,13 is not very common, but nevertheless explored by James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.130, referring among others to Marcus Barth, 1951, p.322.328.
More recently also advocated by Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.604.
The metaphorical use is suggested by Acts 1,4; 11,14 where it is in a context of John the Baptist. See James D.G. Dunn, *ET* 89, 1977-8, p.134-38. 173-5.

[140] Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.601.

based on the experience of the one Spirit,[141] the problem is that unity may be based primarily on an experience, which in itself is rather ambivalent. Although Paul in 1 Corinthians shows that experiences of the Spirit are vital, it should be noted that Paul's answer contains an attack on those who place too great an emphasis on the individual's charisma; hence the appeal to unity and the argument on subordination of charisma to unity. What is problematic also is that Paul's imagery is either overloaded, or inconsistent, so that his argument comes across as weak. If we recall Paul's argument in 1,10-14, the foundation for unity is the cross, or the Christ event, not the shared experience of the Spirit. This means then that here he shifts to the one Spirit as foundation for unity, which seems at odds with his statements in 1. It is more likely that Paul finds a reason for the disunity in the variety of spiritual experiences which individuals may have used as grounds for identification. If this was actually the case then Paul would want to question claims of experiences of the Spirit as creating group rivalry.

If Paul instead argues for unity primarily on the basis of the unity of the body of Christ, the Spirit has a different function.[142] The translation I suggest is therefore "prompted by the one Spirit" since this can refer to the power behind ecclesiological identity and unity, as a power that creates an awareness of having a child relationship with the one God. This means that while the Spirit is the true mark of identification, it is not to be equated with baptism as a ritual boundary. It allows the interpretation that the Spirit as power of God causes the individual to enter into community with Christ,[143] an entry that is also entry to a community. It also opens up the prospect that baptism as incorporation marks a social change.

Even when the literal meaning of "to baptise" is chosen, it raises questions: Does Paul use "baptise" as a symbol of a vertical relationship, or is the rite the constitutive act of the community? Or both? While a literal baptismal rite can serve to express change of religious identity,

---

[141] Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.130: "It is their experience of the *one* Spirit (not water-baptism) which is the basis of their unity." (His italics.) See also, *Unity and Diversity*, 1977, p.160.
See also Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987, 1991, p.604.

[142] The remaining of chapter 12 on charismata, and chapter 14 on the gift of tongues opposed to prophecy, both show that a variety of gifts are recognized as important. But chapter 13, as the crown of the argument, points to love as the principle on which the variety of gifts are to be valued.
Paul S. Minear, *Images*, 1960, p.195, has made the point that the image of the body and the image of love should be seen as one image, understood in their ecclesiological significance.

[143] See Lars Hartman, *Auf den Namen*, 1991, p.68.

crossing a boundary, it can also express a social change. Either way, it expresses a change from a past to a present identity. Paul touches on this question in 12,2, where the ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε indicates a former identity, a past opposed and contrasted to the present. Even if the "now" is missing, the change of status is implicit in the statement on confession: "Jesus is Lord". This therefore is another boundary mark and sign of unity since it identifies a christo-centric confession. If used in a rite it is a means by which to enter a community.

Former identity is found also in 12,13, "Jews or Greek, slaves or free".[144] But since the verb indicating what they were in the past is missing, it is not very clear why these distinctions no longer apply. So, the answer to whether 12,13 is indicative of a former social identity, should perhaps be left equally ambiguous.[145] Paul's reason for treating these differences in passing could be that he was more concerned with oneness than with establishing that social differences had been abolished. If ecstatic experiences had created boundaries of disunity the principle on which unity rests had also changed. This may explain why Paul is concerned with oneness, imaged as one body and referred to as grounded in the one Spirit. Moreover, if we compare 12,27: you are, (ἐστε) the body of Christ, with Gal 3,28, εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, present identity is common to both. Hence the change of social identity may be associated with having been baptised in both contexts. And if the emphasis on present unity is taken as an argument for the fact that a former social and religious identity has been changed, it then assumes that social and religious unity needs to be expressed ritually through baptism.

Because the aorist, ἐβαπτίσθημεν, is used with the plural subject, ἡμεῖς πάντες, any change occurred in the past and was moreover shared by "all". If baptism is understood literally as a water rite the reference is to the ritual experience they all have in common. The unifying factor is not the rite itself, but the Christ reality which the rite actualises for the individual and the community.[146] What is traditionally expressed as incorporation into the body of Christ[147] means that the ritual is a sign of

---

[144] Galatians 3,28; 1 Cor 1,26-27; Rom 10,12; Col 3,11.

[145] The missing reference to "no longer male and female", as found in Gal 3,28, is part of the same ambiguity. Cf. Johannes Nissen, in *Dåben*, 1982, p.215.

[146] See Johannes Nissen, in *Dåben*, 1982, p.217.
The shared ritual experience is not a sufficient foundation for unity, as Ralph P. Martin, *The Spirit*, 1984, p.24, seems to say.

[147] Thus, e.g. W.F. Flemington, *IDB*, p.350.

group participation and the rite expresses a changed social identity. And if it is used to express a changed religious identity, the symbol focuses on the crossing from an identity that is "no longer" to one that is "now" since it refers back to an identity defined as belonging to Christ. In both cases the boundary is marked by a symbolic act that reflects a reality behind it, since it makes visible the change that takes place with respect to corporate belonging.

Visibility, finally, raises the question whether or not baptism is a rite through which the community constitutes itself. It is noteworthy that Paul never writes about baptism as a theological problem. When Paul uses the expression, εἰς ἕν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, "baptised into one body", the issue is corporate unity, clearly assuming that by baptism one can be added to a church. From the individual's point of view the focus is on being included in an already existing group, not on the individual's personal experience of unity with Christ.[148] He does not with this say that the church comes into existence in a rite. However, this does not exclude the possibility that the baptismal rite can serve as a symbol of reconstituting the church and making its oneness visible.[149] From the point of the community, this makes good sense, because the community's acceptance of members may be an occasion on which its continuous existence is secured.

If εἰς is given the meaning "with a view to",[150] as a consequence εἰς ἕν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν may be translated "so as to become one body".[151] The problem is that the emphasis here lies on the result of being baptised; hence eschatological identity, rather than ecclesiological identity, is in focus. While it cannot be excluded that Paul has this in mind, it seems more likely from the overall interest in divisions within the church, that he argues for ecclesiological incorporation as this takes place in a ritual act. Past incorporation, not the goal of it, is what "baptised to" refers to.

In relation to the question of identity, the second part of 12,13 with the aorist, ἐποτίσωθημεν, "we were given to drink" is conspicuous. What does

---

[148] Against James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.128; C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p.289.

[149] For a different approach and a similar conclusion, see Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 1983, p.141: "Durch die Taufe wird der einzelne in den ihm vorausliegenden Leib Christi integriert. Die Taufe konstituiert nicht den Leib Christi, aber sie ist der geschichtliche Ort der Aufnahme in diesen Leib und der reale Ausdruck der in Christus begründeten Einheit der ἐκκλησία. Insofern is die Taufe das Einheit stiftende Sakrament der Kirche." However, I find that the historical aspect is misplaced in this context.

[150] Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.128.

[151] Thus C.K. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 1976, p. 288.

this mean? Does this refer to change of identity? That this should be a reference to the Lord's supper can be excluded, both on contextual grounds and because an imperfect would be the most obvious verbal form to use when participating in the supper.[152] It is possible that the phrase is a second reference to baptism.[153] If it is, Why would Paul refer twice to the rite of baptism? And why use this particular odd image? It seems that the answer must be found in the context's emphatic use of Spirit, less than in the drinking image. If the Spirit is understood as fluid, the verb comes as a natural expression for receiving it, not just in an external manner, but as an internal gift that has penetrated and totally renewed the person involved.[154] Taken this way, the initial gift of the Spirit becomes part of an initiation experience, although not necessarily combined with the rite of baptism.[155] This means that for Paul both the gift of faith and the gift of the Spirit are important factors to bring about an incorporation, but baptism becomes a means by which to enter.

In sum: When Paul refers to a baptismal experience in 12,13 the argument is on unity imaged as body. "We were all baptised" refers to a past experience, and the rite marks incorporation. By using the body as a new image of identity, Paul refers to a corporal understanding of the church, reflecting that boundaries mark the individual's incorporation into the body of Christ. The Spirit is given the role of power to effect this change. With this ecclesiology Paul can remind his readers of the already existing community that manifests itself ritually, thereby affirming belonging to Christ. Alternatively expressed, baptism functions as a rite of entry, not as a mark of experience of the Spirit. What is important is baptism as a shared experience, or the fact that baptism in the past marked an incorporation.

---

[152] Cf. Gerhard Delling, *Die Taufe*, 1963, p.119, n.423.

[153] For this see W.F. Flemington, *Baptism*, 1953, p.56; G.J. Cuming, *NTS* 27, 1981, p.285; Udo Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit*, 1983, p.141; Ralph P. Martin, *The Spirit*, 1984, p.24; Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 1982, p.108-09.
Following from this, is the view that baptism, as a sacrament, somehow conveys or imparts the gift of the Spirit.

[154] In this way the imagery is still related to body.
The Old Testament imagery of spirit and breath suggest life and vitality, as well as renewal in its totality, thus Ps 104,29; Isa 42,5; Ezek 11,19-20; 37,5-6.14
The imagery in the Old Testament of the pouring of the spirit may suggest pouring as a metaphor for the experience of the presence of the spirit, cf. Isa 32,15; 44,3; Ezek 39,29; Joel 2,28. This is how James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.131 interprets this image.

[155] This is consistent with my interpretation of Gal 3,27, see below in (4).

(4) Baptism: A Ritual of Changed Identity. Galatians 3,26-29.

Only one passage in Galatians, 3,26-29, mentions baptism explicitly. This text is highly significant because it occurs in a clear context of identity and boundaries providing us with one of the most important keys to understanding the meaning of baptism.[156]

Four expressions, all in the second person and in present indicative, carry ideas of identity and boundaries.[157] Thus:

You, *πάντες*,

- are children of God, *υἱοί θεοῦ ἐστε*,
- qualified as *διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (v. 26),
- are one in Christ, *εἷς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (v.28),
- being no longer, *ἔνι*, divided in groups, (v.28),
- for, *ἄρα*, you are Abraham's offspring, *σπέρμα*,
  heirs, *κληρονόμοι*, according to God's promise (v.29).

With these status terms Paul reminds the Galatians both of their present status, using *ἐστέ*, and of their old identity, using *ἔνι*. In addition to this, Paul uses the aorist indicatives, in the expression: *ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε* in v.27.[158] Moreover, the two of them are statements referring to unity, *εἷς* in v.28, and *σπέρμα* in v.29. This passage can be taken as Paul's answer to the question of what it means to be children of God; by contrasting the "no longer" valid identity with the present status, he can show that there is a change of identity.[159] The new status is as children of God (4,4-5).[160] The proof of this change in relation-

---

[156] The structure of this passage is complex in spite of its brevity. For a discussion see e.g. Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.151. It seems beyond doubt that baptism is the central issue here, whether or not one accepts the reuse of a liturgy, cf. Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.181-85.

[157] Present indicative of a simple assertion of a present reality.

[158] *γάρ* confirms the second statement, cf. Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.154.

[159] The status of the Galatians, as no longer under the law in the present, *οὐκέτι... ἐσμεν* in 3,25; *οὐκέτι... δοῦλος* in 4,7 and *τότε...νῦν* in 4,8-9. Cf. also the reference Paul gives to his own status as apostle, referring to the past, using imperfect in 1,13-14, to his present status of being entrusted with the gospel to Gentiles, using the resultative perfect in 2,7, and to the change caused by the call of God, using aorist in 1,15-16. The same can be observed in Paul's reference to the Antioch episode and the accusation against Peter for maintaining old boundaries. Here, in 2, 16, he uses *εἰδότες*, equal to a present, and in 2,20 *ζῶ*, both in a reference to the present situation of salvation, and aorist in 2,19 together with a perfect passive of the change of status brought in Christ.

[160] Present tense in *υἱοί εἰσιν* in 3,7 and *υἱός (εἰ)*. Not seen by Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.275, who takes adoption to be a status given in baptism.

ship is the experience of the Spirit (4,6) given εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν[161] as an answer to faith.[162] It is significant that Paul refers to the qualification provided by Christ, and that this is central to the argument as a whole (v.26.27.28.29). The conclusion in v.29 sums up what it means to be one humanity in σπέρμα; by avoiding direct reference to the covenant, and by applying κληρονόμοι to "all" his readers, Paul demonstrates that covenantal identity needs redefinition, and that boundaries are changed when Christ is identified with Abraham's seed.

Three factors determine change of identity: First, fundamentally a change of status is by means of faith, διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[163] Secondly, status is in personal, not ethnic, language with family metaphors, υἱός, υἱοί, and adoption by God as frame of reference.[164] Thirdly, the divisions of the old social, national and cultural identity are no longer important when the unifying factor is Christ.[165] This means that identity as relationship with God is expressed now in christo-centric terms, not in national terms.

Scholars differ on how to understand this passage. The majority take the phrase: ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε to be two synonymous expressions that refer to one ritual act, baptism, through which belonging to Christ and/or the church is expressed.[166] A minority of scholars takes both expressions as metaphors for the experience of the Spirit, or for

---

[161] The use of κρᾶζων in 4,6 emphasises the gift of the Spirit as durative, and in tension to the aorist ἐξέπεστειλεν, cf. Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.275.
Cf. also the pr. ptc in 3,5 in relation to the Spirit.

[162] See for example, Erich Dinkler, *in Zu Karl Barths Lehre*, 1971, p.87, for whom Spirit is a consequence of faith.

[163] For διά in this sense, see C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiom Book*, 1960, p.56.73. Faith is best understood as faith in Christ, cf. 3,2, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 1977, p.170.

[164] Stressed by Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.172; he further points to a confessional link to the liturgy of baptism, p.174-5.

[165] Cf. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory*, 1983, p,213: "Gal 3:28 is therefore best understood as a communal Christian self-definition rather than a statement about baptized individuals. It proclaims that in the Christian community all distinctions of religion, race, class, nationality, and gender are insignificant. All baptized are equal, they are one in Christ."

[166] See Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, 1932, p.23; Wilhelm Bousset, *An die Galater*, 1917, p.58; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.147; Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.203-4; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.45; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.263, stressing the act; Henning Paulsen, *ZNW* 71, 1980, p.87; Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.105; Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*, 1990, p.151.
Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.173, takes baptism as a sacrament in which entry is expressed, termed as "Eingehen in das neue Sein".

entry into a spiritual relationship.[167] In addition, the phrase is understood as a reference to the effect of baptism,[168] to the process of baptism,[169] or to the baptismal state of grace.[170] Some see the relation between faith and baptism as most significant.[171] However, since the wider context of 3,1-4,11 suggests that Paul has used both expressions as terms for a changed identity, I shall give special attention to this. I shall reconsider whether the two concepts are synonyms, or parallel phrases pointing to different realities while connected through Christ who is common to both.

If *εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε* is taken on its own, the use of a verb in a plain aorist passive suggests an experience or event in the past, and a rite that is administered by a baptiser.[172] Nothing in the context suggests that this is a metaphor.[173]

Conceivably, *εἰς Χριστὸν* may be a qualification used to distinguish one baptism from another, in particular the baptism associated with John the Baptist, qualified *εἰς μετάνοιαν*.[174] If this were the case there would be need for Paul to give a more elaborate interpretation to explain the difference.[175] Or, if *εἰς Χριστὸν* has overtones of individual dedication,[176] and lacks a social dimension this would explain why Paul reminds the Galatians that their baptism is an act which is community-related.

---

[167] James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.109-10; and *Unity*, 1977, p.158-9.

[168] Thus, baptism can be both a human act and a divine (sacramental) effect ("Wirkung"), cf. Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.124-25; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.173.

[169] Cf. Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.212.

[170] Cf. Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism*, 1950, p.36.

[171] See Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.104-6; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.272.

[172] Rom 6,3, 1 Cor 1,13-17 (active use) and 12,13 suggest a literal sense. See also Oepke, *ThWNT* I, 1933, p.538, who stresses that even a baptism administered by humans is a divine act.

[173] Even if, as suggested by C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiom Book* 1960, p.68-69, *εἰς* may have a metaphorical meaning, this does not mean that the whole expression is a metaphor.
James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.109-11, takes the passive to refer to God as the real subject of the act assuming this is a metaphor for entry into a spiritual (individual) relationship with Christ, although the ritual act is in mind.

[174] Cf. Matt 3,11; Acts 13,24 and 19,4. See Chapter Five.
Particularly stressed by Lars Hartman, *NTS* 20, 1973/74, p.432-40.

[175] Cf. the false qualifications in 1 Cor 1,13-17; 10,2.

[176] Cf. Lars Hartman, *StTh* 28, 1974, p.21-48, esp. p.25.
The sacramental aspect which some find, see for instance Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.173, and Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.105, is may be anachronistic.

The community baptises, therefore the most common interpretation of εἰς *Χριστὸν* is sound. This suggests εἰς *Χριστὸν* is an abbreviation or equivalent of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα *Χριστοῦ*[177] or εἰς ἕν σῶμα.[178] In each case Christ is the adjectival qualification. The frame of reference is christological and ecclesiological. If the expression is formulaic,[179] it belongs in a community's liturgical setting with references either to a mystical relationship with Christ,[180] or better to entry into a community.[181] If the expression is a dogmatic statement parallel to 3,26, "in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith", it qualifies the individual's relationship with God, rather than the community. Since the context suggests that the relationship with God changed as a result of God's intervention, that faith is one response, baptism another, the expression is best understood as both a confessional formula that sets confessional boundaries to the outside non-Christian and as a liturgical confession that sets internal boundaries. By offering a change of identity through a ritual act the church defines its doctrinal and social boundaries in terms of belonging to Christ.

The second expression, *Χριστὸν* ἐνεδύσασθε, "you have clothed yourselves", is most commonly understood as an explanatory phrase for "baptised in Christ".[182]

---

[177] Cf. Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.203; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.45; Heinrich Schlier, *An die Galater*, 1971, p.173; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.147. See also Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.44-59. However, it is of note that the expression, into the name of Christ is not used explicitly by Paul; it belongs to the context of Acts, see 8,16; 19,5; there is only an implicit reference in 1 Cor 1,13.15.

[178] Cf. 1 Cor 13,13. σῶμα may be either a metaphor for the community, or church, or a metaphor from a gnostic background. See Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.187; Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.45; Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.105; Erich Dinkler, *RGG* 6, p.631.

[179] See Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.49-59, for a discussion.
Whether there has been a liturgy in which there was an information about status, as Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.186, suggests, cannot be proved, in spite of the context relation to status.
Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, denies that there is a formula and prefers to see a relation to salvation, p.262-3.

[180] This has the potential to be over-interpreted in an individualistic way, cf. G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, p.274, who sums up:: "Faith is needful *before* baptism, that Christ and his Gospel may truly be confessed in it; *in* baptism, to receive what God bestows; and *after* baptism, in order to abide in the grace so freely given and to work out by that what God has wrought within (Phil 2,12, f)." (Author's italics).

[181] Stressed by Dieter Lührmann, *Wort und Dienst* 13, 1975, p.57: "Durch die Taufe entsteht die Einheit der Gemeinde." Also Erich Dinkler, RGG 6, p.631.

[182] Cf. Jürgen Becker, *An die Galater*, 1976, p.45; Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1974, p.262-3; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.186; Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe*, 1981, p.105; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 1962, 147-51; Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.211-12; L.J. Koch, *Fortolkning*, 1958,

This is assumed rather than argued. The question is not whether or not the expressions are in fact identical, but, since Paul uses them both, what does he want to express with the image of clothing?

A closer look at the context of 3,26-29 shows that Paul is not consistent in his imagery.[183] This is due either to vacillating use of terminology, or to Paul's reuse of a traditional phrase to convey a new meaning.[184] The problem with the metaphor of clothing in this context is that, although the image is person-related, the fact that there is an object, *Χριστός*, blurs the metaphor. Traditional interpretations which take "putting on" as an image of the rite of baptism intensify this confusion, since nothing in the water rite as such suggests the use of the metaphor.[185] What then does this illustrate?

As a person-related metaphor it points to either wearing a dress as a sign of status related to position in society,[186] or being clothed for a purpose, perhaps that of identifying a person's specific religious task.[187] Of interest also is the classical Greek use of *ἐνδύω* with a person as object meaning playing a role.[188] All three interpretations are possible; hence the phrase "put on Christ" could mean, either that Christ has been put on as a sign of social status,[189] or refer to Christ as a special garment with a specific task

---

p.107.
The same is true of James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 1970, p.109-13.

[183] The change from plural *υἱοι* to "one in Christ", the singular *σπέρμα* and the plural *κληρονόμοι* are examples of mixed imagery and inconsistencies related to identity. The inconsistence on boundaries are the two expression: baptised in Christ and put on Christ.

[184] For suggesting a reuse of traditional material, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, 1979, p.187.

[185] The only act which could suggest clothing would be the dressing after rising from the water, for which there is no early evidence, either as separate rite, or as part of the water rite. Going into the water could imply a metaphor like burial, Rom 6,4, or salvation from the flood, 1 Pet 3,20, but none of this is found in Galatians.

[186] As in Esther 5,5. Very often overlooked, nevertheless highly significant, see Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.212.

[187] This is the case of celebration, cf. Mat 22,11, or of war, cf. the imagery in 1 Thes 5,8; Eph 6,11.14.
An Old Testament parallel is Exod 28, 3-4, although this is on the making of the vestments of Aaron, while their is to consecrate him; the robe is one out of six items.
In the cases where LXX uses *ἐνδύω*, the object is e.g. "justice" Job 29,14; "strength" Isa 52,1; "glory" 1 Macc 14,9; "the spirit" 2 Chron 24,20.
For this see Albrecht Oepke, *ἐνδύω*, *TDNT* II, p.319-20.

[188] For textual examples, see Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.204-6, and Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.124-25.

[189] This would be consistent with v. 28: *εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ*.

to undertake.[190] And if ἐνδυω Χριστὸν is taken as role playing then the baptised plays the role of another character.

If the identity context is taken into consideration, all three interpretations could be accepted because they all indicate that status is somehow changed. Thus, if "put on Christ" equates with being baptised then clothing for a purpose would be relevant. But since the context does not seem to say anything about such a purpose, this is problematic, hence less likely.[191] The reference to equal status in 3,28 could rather suggest that in or after baptism all have the same status before God. The problem is that for Paul post-baptismal status is not a result of baptism, nor does it come about at baptism. Rather status is a God-given adoption before baptism, for faith to respond to. While it is possible that Paul wants to say all have the same privileged position now, in contrast to former restricted advantages to some only, certain reservations are needed.[192] The theatrical context deserves greater attention, not least in view of the importance of the theatre in Hellenistic culture.[193]

This interpretation has the advantage of drawing on a meaningful cultural context, applicable to the individual and to social unity. Not only does this seem a possible interpretation, but also the most probable.[194] If Paul is reminding the Galatians here of their change of status both in the reference, "you were baptised into Christ" and in the dress image, what exactly is his point? That Paul uses two expressions for the past change seem to indicate that they are not identical. If "to put on Christ" is not the same as a baptism which he elsewhere defines in terms of identification with Christ,[195] but rather means to imitate him,[196] it is an image for the

---

[190] M. Barth, *IDB* Suppl Vol, 1976, p.85-89, esp. p.88, suggest that Gal 3,27 means being clothed for an office, with the robe of a high priest or of a Roman official.
In relation to purpose, seen as purpose of being united with Christ, the interpretation of being clothed to have the magic power of a god is also interesting, cf. Wilhelm Bousset, *An die Galater*, 1917, p.58-59.

[191] Against M. Barth, Ibid. The context is as already stressed on identity, with no indication of being dressed to priesthood or office.

[192] Receiving the Spirit does not make us sons; it is our being made sons that enables us to receive the Spirit, cf. Gerhard Ebeling, *The Truth*, 1985, p.221.

[193] See Emil Schürer, *History* II, 1986-87, p.46-48.

[194] Cf. Paul's use of images from a context of sport, 1 Cor 9,24-26; Phil 3,14; 2.Tim 4,7-8.
See Albrecht Oepke, *An die Galater*, 1973, p.124-5 and Ernest de Witt Burton, *Galatians*, 1964, p.204-6.

[195] This is suggested by David Michael Stanley, *TS* 18, 1957, p.185.

[196] See James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus*, 1975, p.326-38.

consequences of the already changed status.[197]

As a corollary I may add that there is no good reason for doubting that Paul's readers would be familiar with the theatrical image; hence his suggestion that they are given a permanent role to play makes sense. If the second metaphor, "put on", is parallel but not identical to "baptised," then the expression refers to the gift of the Spirit.[198] There are no reasons for believing that the gift of the Spirit is located only in baptism if the context is taken into consideration, even if Spirit and baptism are related. Thus, while Paul refers to the Spirit as a sign and proof of faith or rather of being in a child relationship with God(cf. 3,3; 4,6; 3,14; cf. Rom 8,11.23), he can also refer to the diverse gifts of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12).[199] As Paul elsewhere uses this image in an ethical sense it seems likely that he does so here.[200] Moreover, if the Spirit is interpreted as a mark of identity, it stands for sanctification, since it is related to living the life of Christ, its quality being love (cf. 2,20; 5,25). This means that in Christ and the Spirit a new life is given. Therefore Paul can continue in 3,28-9 to state that the old identity, with its cultural, national, and social human divisions is insignificant, and that a new identity without distinctions replaces it.[201] The climax is that belonging to Christ means to be heirs and seed of Abraham. This new identity begins as a changed relationship with God through adoption, as God's gift of the Spirit,

---

[197] The best way to interpret the aorist is to take it in a gnomic sense, cf. BDF 333.

[198] Cf. E. Earle Ellis, *Pauline Theology*, 1989, p.32, following James Dunn. The alternative offered by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory*, 1983, p.214, is that being baptised means entering the sphere of the resurrected Christ, the life-giving spirit manifest in the Christian community. Baptism, then accomplishes both individual salvation and entry into the community. The problem with this is that the change in metaphor is not explained.

[199] The absence of the Spirit in 1 Cor 1,10-17 and Rom 6,4 is of note; the presence of the Spirit as a separate event in 1 Cor 10,2 and 12,3, as demonstrated above is equally significant.

[200] The ethical imperative is found in Rom 13,14; cf. Col 3,10. See also 1 Thess 5,8; 1 Cor 15,53-54; Eph 4,24; 6,11-17.
Relevant is also Paul's use of ἁγιάζω, ἁγιασμός. Since 1 Cor 6,11 refers to both sanctification and purification. The text is ambiguous, and while it may refer to baptism it may equally well be understood as a reference to spiritual transformation, see e.g. Gordon D. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 1987.1991, p.247.

[201] The pair ἄρσεν- θῆλυ in 3,28 is without parallel. In allusion to creation, Gen 1,26-27, it suggests a radical "new creation" in Gal 6,15. Cf. Michel, Bouttier, *NTS* 23, 1976-77, p.7.
While ethnic an cultural identity are not affected by the theology of "new creation", the social identity is. However, the lack of concrete changes reflect conditions of life. In practice compromises are reached in spite of principles, cf. Johannes Nissen, *Dåben*, 1983, p.222-23.

before, in or after baptism.

To sum up. The only reference in Galatians to baptism occurs in a context in which Paul proclaims identity as changed. The change is from an old status limited by social, national and sexual differences to a new status of adoption. This new status is basically a reversed relationship with God, initiated and established by God. The proof is the gift of the Spirit, with "baptised into Christ" as one expression for a change of status, and "clothed" another. Although they are parallel statements, they are not identical. In the same way, coming to faith is different from baptism, yet related. The central message in Gal 3,27 is one of changed identity, in which baptism plays an important role.

IV. Conclusion.

My analysis has shown a clear pattern of interdependence between self-understanding and boundaries in the Pauline texts on baptism and circumcision. When Paul's view on boundaries is assessed, it is conspicuous that entry into the covenant is not addressed as an issue. Thus, the idea that the covenant can be affirmed or entered into is not found, either in relation to circumcision or to baptism. The hesitant use of ethnic categories as definitions for the Christian community shows that national boundaries through birth are no longer significant. Because Paul defines identity in terms of a relationship with God through faith in Christ and experienced as presence of the Spirit, he redefines boundaries. So when Paul creates new images for identity and boundaries, he does so in the light of a changed identity. Here, and in the theology of the cross, lies the real reason for rejecting circumcision and introducing baptism as a new boundary.

From a sociological point of view identity needs to be marked off, and for that purpose a visible symbol that expresses social change is necessary. Therefore when identity derives from belonging to Christ, it results in boundaries that mark this allegiance. They are inclusive and exclusive on theological grounds, with social consequences.

It is significant that when Paul argues against circumcision, baptism is never referred to. It is equally significant that baptism is never explained, but rather used to support other arguments, such as church unity. However, when circumcision is denied its theological value, it is also questioned as identity mark from a Jewish point of view. Christian baptism becomes a boundary mark because it symbolises both inclusion into a faith relationship and separation from a community that does not identify itself with Christ, not simply because circumcision is devalued.

When Paul seeks a justification for the replaced boundary mark in the Old Testament tradition, he draws on the Exodus crossing, because this supports Paul's argument for continuity and sameness. Thus he finds a parallel for baptism in the crossing of the Red Sea, because this event marks the entry to the liberation which the Exodus generation and the Christian church have in common. Only if baptism is read in the light of the event in its totality and ecclesiologically does this story serve as a rationale for baptism.

Rather than confining baptism to the sphere of individual commitment, Paul sees baptism in an ecclesiological context even when it marks identification with Christ. It is fundamental to Paul's ideas of Christian self-understanding that status in relation to God and to each other is conceived as a change of status. While the Spirit is proof of reversed relationship with God, ritual baptism marks a change since it proclaims what is no longer important and what is valid now. The external and internal boundary is between all who can accept Christ as the only true identification, and those who choose a false identification.

With regard to church identity, Paul prefers metaphors that are related to the human body, to kinship and family. So, when belonging is defined as being "in Christ", the boundary-crossing image is entry into "the body of Christ"; hence baptism is incorporation. However, entry by means of the rite of baptism is never the only expression for a change of identity. When identity is expressed as belonging to God's family of adopted children, then the gift of the Spirit may be just as important a demarcation. The metaphor of "clothing" emphasises this.

Church unity is enhanced through a ritual experience, therefore participating in the rite of baptism becomes an occasion on which the church reconstitutes itself. Because Christ is the only mark of both exclusion and inclusion, identity and boundary symbols are both inclusive and exclusive, Christ being the leading principle for who are inside and who outside. Exclusiveness of identity is reflected in a boundary that sets faith in Christ as opposed to a lack of faith. The inclusiveness of identity is the inclusiveness of Christ which is reflected in a boundary mark that takes in all humanity, due to the fact that a new creation is in process. The basis on which both new and old boundaries are assessed is the cross and resurrection of Christ, the presence of the Spirit and of God's love.

Summary and Conclusion.

In this study I have looked at the way identity shapes the ritual boundaries of a community by focusing particularly on how limited communities understood themselves in covenant terms. I have approached texts from Palestinian Judaism and Pauline Christianity with the purpose of interpreting covenant identity from a phenomenological and sociological point of view. This method could in principle be applied to any period in history, even broadened to include more concepts within the same textual frame. One would then doubtless achieve more convincing results. Within the limits of the present thesis, however, I have demonstrated a pattern of interdependence between a community's self-understanding and its ritual boundaries. This means in concrete terms, that when covenant identity changed, boundary rites that mark covenantal belonging also changed. That this should be so, is, of course, no new insight, but in this thesis I have been able to explore the dynamics of the change and its rationale to a degree not done before. Moreover, it should now be clear that this change was not a simple matter of historical development of the covenant concept. In historical hindsight it seems self-evident that when Christianity emerges from Judaism, baptism replaces circumcision. But if one looks at first generation Christianity from within, it is far from evident that the early Church would break away from Judaism, nor is it obvious why the differences between Judaism and the early church would lead to a breach, and why in consequence the ritual boundaries should change at all, or as they did.

Based on a comprehensive analysis of particularly important texts I have suggested that fundamentally the break away from Judaism was caused by a clash of two different concepts of identity. By focusing on a range of texts from the Old Testament, through intertestamental writings to Paul, I have demonstrated that not only was covenantal belonging gradually narrowed down in Judaism, but in the early church covenant was not a term for horizontal relationship but replaced by other terms expressing a Christo-centric identity. Moreover, although boundary rites were constantly reinterpreted in Judaism, the change from circumcision to baptism took place because the particular Christian self-understanding from the very beginning was based on a different interpretation of what relationship with God means. Thus, the reasons for boundaries being broken down and replaced in this case are essentially theological and rooted in a consciousness that identity has changed.

I. Summary.

Overall, the material reveals three types of corporate identity, each reflected in a particular boundary rite, different because a different identity is expressed. First, I found that where covenant identity is defined primarily in national terms, boundaries are around the nation and serve to affirm national and social belonging; birth is marked by a rite of passage. This is basically the pattern that is valid for Jewish identity in the Old Testament, and particularly in the community behind the Book of Jubilees. Due to a socio-political crisis the concern for remaining within the God-given boundaries is articulated in a demand for Israel to separate itself from the Gentiles. The people's threatened identity is the main problem. One of the best examples of a boundary issue that is a foil to the identity issue is found in the law demanding that circumcision be practised. When the author calls for a specific mark of identity, the argument builds on the Old Testament covenant history and tradition which then becomes a theology of exclusive election, especially related to a ritual practice that has social separation as its purpose. By guarding the people's boundaries, its particular identity is being protected.

Secondly, where identity is defined in more narrow categories such as priestly purity, purity rites function as boundary rites to mark the occasion for an individual's decision to adopt the life-style of the community. This pattern can be observed in 11QTemple, the Damascus Document and the Community Rule. The interdependence of group identity and boundaries in these texts shows that the community's concern for purity, its ritual and moral practice, above all is a concern to keep a priestly identity intact, to preserve its particularity. This is given concrete form in the community's boundaries defined by priestly standards. By living in accordance with strict rules and meticulous attention to the details of the law, these communities believe they can preserve their identity, thereby keeping both their locality and their community in a state of purity. By calling individuals, not the people as a whole, to enter into a covenant commitment, these communities are identified by their practice in general, and by their boundary rituals that affirm covenant belonging in particular.

A brief look at the material on John the Baptist has been sufficient to conclude that there is no trace here of a pattern of interdependence, since there is no evidence of a community with clear self-identity and defining boundaries around him. Rather, he stands as a prophetic figure on a par with other judgment prophets. Since covenant terminology is not directly used, the whole question of identity is much too obscure for me to gain any handle on it. An analysis of this will have to await a future study. His baptism is

not a ritual that marks ecclesiological belonging; the orientation is eschatological. More importantly, there is no evidence that Paul had any knowledge of a "baptism of forgiveness", since he never refers to this aspect when focusing on the significance of baptism. Thus I have concluded that John the Baptist is not a relevant figure for a thesis oriented to the study of ecclesiological identity and ritual boundaries.

The third type of corporate identity is found in Paul's theology. Thus, when Paul no longer accepts ecclesiological identity defined in covenant terms, as we shall see in a moment, the reason is that he is an advocate of a very different self-understanding. Belonging to the Christian community is defined in categories of belief, or belief systems, namely a confessed faith in Christ; not in terms of birth. Consequently the most important boundary rite is the demarcation line between a true belief system and a false system. After analysing Paul's arguments concerning covenant, circumcision and baptism, I have concluded that for Paul Christian identity depends on the community's faith in Christ, on how faith is visible in Christo-centric symbols, in the rite of baptism in particular. Although there is a certain continuity with the past, the past is reinterpreted with Christ as the hermeneutical key. Thus, from a redefinition of covenant as a vertical relationship with God, and from an eschatological reorientation, Paul accepts a sameness in relationship to God, but christological and pneumatological principles are employed for the sake of defining what is a true relationship with God in Christ and the Spirit.

From my examination of the Pauline material I have further concluded that when baptism functions primarily as initiation rite it also functions as an ecclesiological boundary mark, whereas circumcision is reinterpreted theologically so that it no longer has such a function. However, the relation between circumcision and baptism is more complex than one of replacement. For, since Paul never talks about covenant as a relationship humans can enter, he also never characterises baptism as a boundary to the covenant. He never associates circumcision and covenant affirmation, but rather states that "circumcision" is of no particular value. Instead "baptism" functions as a unifying factor, "church", *ekklesia*, becomes the principal term for corporate belonging, and "covenant" is limited to a vertical relationship with God. The following three points set this in relief.

First, I take issue with those interpretations that in an unreflective way take "covenant" as a term for continuity, implying that for Paul there exists an unbroken ecclesiological identity. If my interpretation above is right, that Paul interprets covenant primarily as a relationship with God, then this view builds on significant theological innovations. For what is at

issue for Paul is the inbuilt tendency in an ethno-centric covenant ideology to make covenant stand for exclusiveness. This tendency can only be avoided by using "covenant" in a theo-centric sense. Moreover, if these differences are taken seriously, they explain why Paul must reject the theological significance as well as the social function of circumcision. Since the rite has a history that is associated with a call to separate, and to exclude, it is unacceptable as a boundary mark. By contrast, baptism has the potential to break even the social structures, being a ritual of incorporation into the body of Christ (1 Cor 12,13), of identification with Christ (1 Cor 1,10-17), and of change of status (Gal 3,26-29)

Secondly, I must necessarily disagree with the classic and widespread view that the "new covenant" replaces the "old covenant". Both from a sociological and a theological perspective this is a wrong conclusion. Since Paul does not identify the church with covenant, he cannot regard baptism as a covenant ritual, so that baptism is not an entry into a "new" covenant that equals the church.

Thirdly, I challenge those interpreters who take baptism primarily as a soteriological experience and thus overlook baptism in its initiatory function. The reason Paul can refer to baptism in Galatians 3, 1 Corinthians 1, 10 and 12 is not that he associates baptism with forgiveness, nor that he thinks of baptismal rites as a continuation of covenant rituals within Palestinian Judaism. Rather, the reason baptism can be used in arguments on unity and change is that it has been introduced in the church to function as an initiation rite, and thus serves both as a symbol for the community's shared belief and as a sign of the individual's confession. Thus, Paul accepts baptism as initiation when he talks of shared baptism in his argument for oneness and against divisions, for equality and freedom against human created differences. He sees the rationale for baptism in its symbolic value for and in the community, not in its salvational effect. In other words, as a result of Paul's ecclesiological identity, the church defined as a corporate relationship and as a community of those who share faith in Christ, he is able to advocate boundaries that reflect this. In this way baptism functions as initiation into the community that shares an identity in Christ, and is not just an individual experience of salvation.

In short, within the limits of the material looked at here I can conclude that covenant identity has been expressed in more than one way, as is particularly clear when ritual boundaries are analysed. The range is from (a) an ethno-centric national covenant established on God's initiative with broadly defined boundaries of birth, affirmed in circumcision; via (b) a narrow priestly covenant, a particularistic group identity, with equally

narrow purity boundaries that are set to affirm the covenant, to mark an entry into a relationship that builds on the principle of law; to (c) Paul's very different community of faith with Christo-centric identity, with baptism as a boundary (not affirming covenant belonging nor acting as an entry to a covenant relationship), functioning as a rite to mark incorporation into the church and signifying change of status by symbolising identification with Christ.

II. Concluding Reflections on the Necessity of Baptism.

The fact that the contemporary ecumenical discussion has been a significant part of my own background, both in undertaking this study and in shaping my interpretation of the ancient texts, makes me return to this and point to some corollaries in relation to the contemporary situation.[1] I am aware that this is beyond my immediate expertise. Nevertheless I shall offer a few reflections arising as tentative conclusions out of my studies, because I see it as a scholarly duty to engage in an interpretation of ancient texts not only in their own historical contexts but also as a reflection of the tradition we build on and as part of an ongoing dialogue between different traditions. Thus there is an obligation to be concerned with our own self-understanding and to offer some interpretations of what helps to shape our identity.

The crisis of baptism is a crisis of the church. When the crises of the churches are identity related, these are reflected in the way the churches interpret and practise baptism. Unless the churches become aware of what they are, they will not know how members become members, nor know what belonging entails. If my pattern of interdependence is used, the present day's image of what the church is inevitably corresponds to how baptism functions and what it accomplishes. If the point is taken that when either the concept of church or baptism changes, the other changes accordingly, then it follows that theological reflection on ecclesiological identity is desperately needed. Moreover, what is needed is a meaningful liturgy that focuses also on baptism in its function as a boundary marker, and, last but not least, a grass-roots movement that questions traditional interpretations of church identity and is aware of a need for changes that are visible in boundary marks. The solution to this crisis is not easy nor is there any one right answer for different situations. I shall give a few examples from the point of view of the pattern of interdependence between identity and boundaries.

---

[1] See particularly the studyreport on BEM, 1990, cf. my Bibliography I.

In countries, like my own native Denmark, where the church has a long history and a tradition of being the church of the people, and where it has constitution and status as the state church and/or folk church, baptism by tradition functions as a rite of passage that marks belonging by birth to both church and society. Needless to say, baptism is infant baptism. Baptismal certificates are birth certificates, the contract relationship is formal. So, when religious and national belonging coincide, baptism is a ritual not of crossing a boundary, but of affirming the church in its establishment. Baptism is a contract, serving as a guarantee of salvation and membership of the church. It has more or less the same role as circumcision in Old Testament society. However, social and cultural development in general, and secularisation in particular, put this practice in question. Statistical counts show that the number of children being baptised, in for instance the (Lutheran) church of Scandinavia, the (Anglican) Church of England and the European Roman Catholic churches, is declining.[2]

The answer to this crisis is not as simple as to change practice and move from infant to believers' baptism. The call for a conscious belief before baptism reflects one type of ecclesiological identity, which is prevalent in the Baptist tradition, but which also lies behind a number of movements calling for a change of practice and for consciousness about baptism. One danger with a simplistic call for believer's baptism is that it emphasises faith as being intellectually articulated, the acceptance of a belief system conforming to one interpretation of Christian belief. Hence it has a tendency to be exclusive. Another danger is that baptism becomes individualised, stressing the individual's faith and confession, setting the community aspect aside. It easily becomes a proclamation that salvation means "justified by sincerity".[3] Baptism is almost reduced to a subjective promise. When baptism is only a "conversion rite" that marks the boundary to a belief, it affirms a church identified as being constituted only by individuals, and denies the church as a social community.

As an initiation rite baptism has the capacity to mark a change of status, to proclaim that there is a "no longer" identity and a "now" identity. This proclamation for the individual ought to take place in the context of a church that is conscious of its role as the church of God. Hence other models of the church than the two mentioned are needed. There are numerous images to be drawn on from the New Testament, and the church as family is

---

[2] For Denmark, see *Dansk Kultur- og mediestatistik*, 1980-1992; for England, see Robert Currie et al., *Churches*, 1977; for Spain, *Compendio Christiano Espania*, 1991.

[3] I owe this to Robert W. Jenson, in *Christian Dogmatics 2*, 1984, p.331.

just one of them. By choosing family categories for identity, baptism may be a symbolic expression of adoption, marking initiation into the family.

As a symbolic act baptism may be interpreted as the symbol of life. When baptism is seen as such it marks the birth (or rebirth) of the individual rather than it marks the occasion on which the church is created, or constituted. The danger is that baptism is reduced to a blessing or thanksgiving for life, and the church is reduced to the place in which the ceremony is performed.

Baptism's reminiscence of a purificatory rite that is performed before entry in order to approach the presence of the holy God, makes it an important symbol of sanctification. Such a symbol of holiness that marks the boundary between the divine and human spheres, may be interpreted as a symbol of consecration. Hence it serves to remind the church of its missionary service to the world, to call individuals to participate in this mission, each according to individual gifts. When baptism is such a rite of "ordination", it affirms the church as a community that has as one purpose to proclaim the presence of the Kingdom of God, and another to realise this Kingdom in its life-style, and to question false images of God.

There are other aspects that could be elaborated. As a reminder of the Exodus event, it is a ritual of liberation; when referring to the action of the Spirit of God, it is a symbol of power; when drawing on the traditions of election and commission, it is a symbol of service. Thus baptism has the potential for being a ritual marking a crossing of a boundary in more than one sense. Not least when the frame of reference is Jesus' baptism, his experience of the Spirit and of a divine commission to go to the world with a message of love, baptism becomes a symbol of a share in love. But, Why is baptism necessary?

Baptism is necessary because each time a baptism is performed in the community it proclaims to the already baptised that baptism is a ritual of identification with Christ. It is necessary because it proclaims that baptism is a ritual of crossing from what is no longer valid, to being accepted as a child of God. It is necessary because it is a prayer asking for the power of the Spirit to be visible as continuous growth in love. It is necessary as a sign that promises forgiveness. And it is necessary as a rite that reminds us of the waters of creation and the gifts given by the God of life, the God of hope and the God of love.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

I. TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS.

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

Berger, Klaus: *Das Buch der Jubiläen, JSHRZ* II, Gütersloh 1981
Charles, R.H.: *The Book of Jubilees, or Little Genesis.* London 1902.
Charlesworth, James H. (Ed.): *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* I-II. London 1983-85.
Hammershaimb, E., Johannes Munck, Bent Noack, Paul Seidelin (ed.)*: De gammeltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer,* (Danish transl.) *i oversættelse og med noter. I-II.* København 1953-76.
Sparks, H.F.D. (Ed.): *The Apocryphal Old Testament.* Oxford 1984.
VanderKam, James C. (Ed.): *The Book of Jubilees.* A Critical Text and Translation. CSCO 510-511, Ae 87-88. Louvain 1989.

Dead Sea Scrolls.

Barthélemy, D. and J.T. Milik: *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Qumran Cave I.* Oxford 1955.
Burrows, Millar (Ed.): *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery.* Vol. I-II, ASOR 1950-51.
Dupont-Sommer, A.: *The Essene Writings from Qumran.* Transl. Geza Vermes. Oxford 1961.
Gaster, Theodor H.: *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation with Introduction and Notes.* New York 1957.
Holm-Nielsen, Svend: *Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran.* Aarhus 1960.
Hvidberg, Flemming Friis: *Menigheden af den nye Pagt i Damascus. Nogle Studier over de af Salomo Schechter fundne og under Titlen "Fragments of a Zadokite Work" udgivne Genîzafragmenter ("Damascusskriftet").* København 1928.
Knibb, Michael A.: *The Qumran Community.* CCWJCW 2, Cambridge 1987.
Leaney, A.R.C.: *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* London, Philadelphia 1966.
Lohse, Eduard (Hrsg.): *Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräisch und Deutsch.* 4. Aufl. München 1986.
Maier, Johann: *Die Texte vom Toten Meer I-II.* München, Basel 1960.
---: *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer.* München, Basel 1978. ET: JSOTS 34, Sheffield 1985.
Mink, Hans Aage: *Tempelrullen,* Unpublished Manuscript.
Nielsen, Eduard og Benedikt Otzen: *Dødehavsteksterne. I oversættelse med noter.* København 1959.
Rabin, Chaim: *The Zadokite Documents.* 2.ed. Oxford 1958.
Rost, Leonhard: *Die Damaskusschrift.* Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 167. Hrsg. Hans Lietzmann. Berlin 1933.
Vermes, G.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.* 3.ed. London 1987.
Wernberg-Møller, P.: *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction.* STDJ I, Leiden 1957.
Yadin, Yigael: *The Temple Scroll I-III.* Jerusalem 1983.

Other Jewish Sources.

Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII-XX. With an English Translation by Louis H. Feldman. London 1969.

---

* *Abbreviations for Lexica, Periodicals and Series follow the the standards of Theologische RealEnzyklopädie (TRE).*

Old and New Testament.

Biblica Hebraica, Ed. Rud. Kittel. 7th Ed. Stuttgart 1951.
Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Liber Jesaiae. Stuttgart 1968.
Septuaginta I-II. Ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart 1935.1982.
Novum Testamentum Graece, 26. Aufl. Nestle- Aland. Stuttgart 1979.
Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, Locis Paralleli evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis, Ed. Kurt Aland, 12. Aufl. Stuttgart 1982.
Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version, with Apocrypha. New York, Oxford 1989. (NRSV).
The Revised English Bible, with Apocrypha. Oxford, Cambridge 1989. (REV).
Moffatt, James: *The New Testament. A New Translation.* London n.d.

Study Documents for Ecumenical Dialogue.

Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. Faith and Order Paper 111. Geneva 1982.
Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry 1982-1990. Report on the Process and Responses. Faith and Order Paper 149. Geneva 1990.
Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Christian Relations. An Unabridged Collection of Christian Documents. Compiled by Helga Cromer. Stimulus Books. New York 1977.
More Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Christian Relations. An Unabridged Collection of Christian Documents 1975-1983. Compiled by Helga Cromer. Stimulus Books. New York 1985.
Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Lutheran Relations. Key Lutheran Statements. Ed. Harold H. Ditmanson. Augsburg, Minneapolis 1990.
The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People. Statements by the World Council of Churches and its Member Churches. Geneva 1988.

II. REFERENCE WORKS.

Bauer, Walter: *Griechisch- Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur.* 5.ed. Berlin 1958.
---: ET by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, Chicago/London 1979.
Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner: *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch.* Bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf, 14.Aufl. Göttingen 1976.
Blass, F., A. Debrunner: *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* A Translation and Revision of the ninth-tenth German Edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk. Chicago 1961.1967.
Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, H.-J. Fabry (Eds.): *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament (ThWAT)* Iff., Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz 1973ff.
---: ET: *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT)* Iff. Transl. by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1974.1977.
Brown, Raymond E., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy (Eds.): *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary.* 2nd ed. London 1989.1990.
Charlesworth, James H.: *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement.* Ass. by P. Dykers and M.J.H. Charlesworth. Ann Arbor, Michigan 1981.
Currie, Robert, Alan Gilbert and Lee Horsley: *Churches and Churchgoers: Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles Since 1700.* London 1977.
Dansk kultur- og mediestatistik 1980-92. København 1992.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study.* SBL Sources for Biblical Study 8. Missoula, Montana 1977.

Galling, Kurt (Ed.): *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft (RGG)* I-VI.[3] Tübingen 1957-65.

Gesenius, Wilhelm: *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das alte Testament.* 17. Aufl. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg 1962.

Goodwin, William W.: *A Greek Grammar,* repr. London 1977.

Haase, Wolfgang, Hildegard Temporini (Hrsg.): *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Teil II Pricipat, Bd. 24.4.Berlin, New York 1987.

Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry R.: *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament I-III.* Repr. Grand Rapid, Michigan 1983.

Hudson, Charles F. and Ezra Abbot: *A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament.* 8.ed. London 1898.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. An Illustrated Encyclopedia I-IV, and Suppl Vol. Nashville 1962. 1976.

Jenni, Ernst, Claus Westermann (Eds.): *Theologisches Hand- wörterbuch zum Alten Testament (THAT)* I-II. München, Zürich 1971. 1975.

Jongeling, B: *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-69.* StDJ VII. Leiden 1971.

Kittel, Gerhard und Gerhard Friedrich: *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (ThWNT)* I-X. Stuttgart 1933-79.

---: ET: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT)* I-X. Transl. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964-76. Repr. 1983-85.

Klauser, Th. et.al. (Eds.): *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt (RAC)* Iff. Stuttgart 1941ff.

Krause, G. and G. Müller (Eds.): *Theologische Realenzyklopädie (TRE)* Iff, Berlin 1977 ff.

Kuhn, Karl Georg: *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten,* Göttingen 1960.

---: "Nachträge zur `Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten'." *RdQ* 4, 1963-64, p.163-234.

Kümmel, W.G., et al (Eds.): *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit (JSHRZ).* Gütersloh 1973ff.

Lawson, Mary (ed): *Compendio Christiano Espano. Eglessias y Missiones.* MARC Europe (London) 1991.

Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed., rev. by H.S. Jones. Oxford 1968.

Maier, Johann: *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion. Von der Zeit Alexander des Grossen bis zur Aufklärung mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20 Jahrhundert.* Berlin, New York 1972.

Metzger, Bruce M.: *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* London, New York 1971.1975.

Moule, C.F.D.: *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek.* 2.ed. Cambridge 1960.

Moulton, W.F. and Geden, A.S.: *A Concordance to the Greek Testament,* Edinburgh 1897.1980.

Pedersen, Johs.: *Hebræisk Grammatik.* 3.opl. København 1950.

Pirot. Louis (Ed.): *Dictionaire de la Bible. Supplement.* Vol 1-10. Paris 1928 ff.

Roth, C. and G. Wigoder (Eds): *Encyclopedia Judaica* 1-17. Jerusalem 1971-72.

Schürer, Emil: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.- A.D. 135). Vol I-III.* A New English Version, revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Miller, Martin Goodman. Edinburgh 1986-87.

Smyth, Herbert Weir: *Greek Grammar,* revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, Massachusetts 1971.

Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck: *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash.* Bd. I-VI, München 1922-61.

III. COMMENTARIES.

Gospels.

Barrett, C.K.: *The Gospel According to St John. An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text.* Repr. London 1962.

Bovon, François: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* EKK III.1. Zürich , Neukirchen-Vluyn 1989.

Brown, Raymond E.: *The Gospel According to John.* Vol I: *Introduction, Translation, and Notes.* AncB 29. Garden City New York 1966.

Bultmann, Rudolf: *Das Evangelium des Johannes.* 13. Aufl. KEK. Göttingen 1953.

Dodd, C.H.: *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge 1963.

Ellis, Peter F.: *The Genius of John. A Composition- Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.* Collegeville, Minnesota 1984.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A.: *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX. A New Translation with Introduction and commentary.* AncB 28. New York et 1981.

Gnilka, Joachim: *Das Evangelium nach Markus.* EKK II.1. Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978.

Grundmann, Walter: *Das Evangelium nach Markus.* ThHK II. Berlin 1977.

---: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* ThHK III. 9.Aufl. Berlin 1981.

Heitmüller, Wilhelm: *Die Johannesschriften.* SNT IV. Göttingen 1920.

Lohmeyer, Ernst: *Das Evangelium des Matthäus.* Hrsg von Werner Schmauch, KEK Sonderband, Göttingen 1967.

---: *Das Evangelium des Markus.* KEK II. 17. Aufl. Göttingen 1967.

Luz, Ulrich: *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* EKK I.1. Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985.

Nepper-Christensen, Poul: *Matthæusevangeliet. En Kommentar.* Aarhus 1988.

Pesch, Rudolf: *Das Markusevangelium I.Teil.* 2. Aufl. HThK II.1. Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1977.

Plummer, Alfred: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S.Luke.* 5. ed. Edinburg 1964.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf: *Das Johannesevangelium.* I. Teil: *Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap.1-4;* II. Teil: *Kommentar zu Kap. 5-12.* HThK IV.I; IV.II. Freiburg, Basel Wien 1965-71.

Schneider, Gerhard: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Kapitel 1-10. Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neun Testament 3.1.* Gütersloh 1977.

Schürmann, Heinz: *Das Lukasevangelium 1.Teil.* 2. Aufl. HThK III.I. Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1982.

Weiß, Joh.; Wilhelm Bousset: *Die Drei Älteren Evangelien.* SNT I, Göttingen 1917.

Romans.

Barrett, C.K.: *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* BNTC. Second ed. London 1991.

Cranfield, C. E. B.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* I-II. ICC. Edinburgh 1975, 1985.

Dunn, James D.G.: *Romans 1-8 and 9-16.* WBC 38 a-b. Dallas, Texas 1988.

Gutjahr, F.S.: *Die Briefe des heiligen Apostels Paulus* III. Graz, Wien 1927.

Jervell, Jacob: *Gud og hans fjender.* Oslo 1973.

Jülicher, Adolf: *Der Brief an die Römer.* SNT II. Göttingen 1917.

Käsemann, Ernst: *An die Römer.* HNT 8a. 4. Aufl. Tübingen 1980.

Kühl, Ernst: *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer.* Leipzig 1913.

Lagrange, M.-J.: *Saint Paul, Épitre aux Romains.* EtB. Paris 1950.

Lietzmann, Hans: *An die Römer.* HNT 8, 5.Aufl. Tübingen 1971.

Michel, Otto: *Der Brief an die Römer.* KEK IV. 14.Aufl. Göttingen 1978.

Nygren, Anders: *Pauli Brev till Romarna.* Tolkning av Nya Testamentet VI. Stockholm 1944.

Pedersen, Sigfred: *Teologisk Kompendium til Romerbrevet.* (Århus) 1985. 1987.
Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* ICC. Edinburgh 1895.
Schlier, Heinrich: *Der Römerbrief.* HThK VI, Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1977.
Stuhlmacher, Peter: *Der Brief an die Römer.* NTD 6, 14.Aufl. Göttingen, Zürich 1989.
Wilckens, Ulrich: *Der Brief an die Römer* I-II, EKK VI,1-2. Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980.

1 Corinthians.

Barrett, C.K.: *A Commentary on The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* BNTC. Second edition. London 1968. repr. 1976.
Bousset, Wilhelm: *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* SNT II. Göttingen 1917.
Conzelmann, Hans: *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* KEK V. 11.Aufl. Göttingen 1969.
Fascher, Erich: *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther.* 1.Teil. ThHK VII,1. Berlin 1975.
Fee, Gordon D.: *The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* NIC. Grand Rapid, Michigan 1987.1991.
Harrisville, Roy A.: *Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. I Corinthians.* ACNT Minneapolis, Minnesota 1987.
Mosbech, Holger: *Første Korinthierbrev, indledet og forklaret.* København, 1931.
Nissen, Johannes: *Første Korinterbrev, fortolket.* Det Danske bibelselskab. København 1990.
Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* ICC Edinburgh 1911. Repr 1967.
Schrage, Wolfgang: *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* EKK VII,1. Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991.
Weiß, Johannes: *Der erste Korintherbrief.* KEK V. 9.Aufl. Göttingen 1910.
Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich: *Die Briefe an die Korinther.* NTD 7. Göttingen 1965.
Wolff, Christian: *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther.* 2.Teil. ThHK VII,2. 2.Aufl. Berlin, Göttingen 1982.

1 and 2 Corinthians.

Lang, Friedrich: *Die Briefe an die Korinther.* NTD 7, Göttingen, Zürich 1986.
Lietzmann, Hans und Werner Georg Kümmel: *An die Korinther* I-II. HNT 9. 4.Aufl. 1949.

2 Corinthians.

Allo, E.-B.: *Saint Paul Seconde Épitre aux Corinthiens.* EtB Paris 1956.
Barrett, C.K.: *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* BNTC. London 1979.
Bousset, Wilhelm: *Der zweite Brief and die Korinther.* SNT II. Göttingen 1917.
Bultmann, R.: *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther.* Hrsg. von E. Dinkler. KEK Sonderband. Göttingen 1976.
Furnish, Victor Paul: *II Corinthians.* AncB. 32A. Garden City New York 1984.
Héring, Jean: *La seconde épitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens.* CNT(N) VIII, Neuchatel, Paris 1958.

Koch, L.J.: *Fortolkning til Paulus' andet Brev til Korinthierne.* 3.ed. København 1958.
Martin, Ralph P.: *2 Corinthians.* WBC 40, Waco Texas 1986.
Odeberg, Hugo: *Pauli Brev till Korintierna.* Stockholm 1944.
Plummer, Alfred: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians.* ICC. Edinburgh 1915, 1966.
Prümm, Karl: *Theologische Auslegung des zweiten Korintherbriefes.* In *Diakonia* Pneumatos. Bd. I, Rom, Freiburg, Wien 1967.
Windisch, Hans: *Der zweite Korintherbrief.* KEK VI, 9.Aufl. Göttingen 1924.
Wolff, Christian: *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther.* ThHK 8. Berlin 1989.

Galatians.

Becker, Jürgen, Hans Conzelmann, Gerhard Friedrich: *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon.* NTD 8. Göttingen 1976.
Betz, Hans Dieter: *Galatians. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia 1979.
Bousset, Wilhelm: *Der Brief an die Galater.* SNT II. Göttingen 1917.
Bring, Ragnar: *Galaterbrevet.* Tolkning av Nya Testamentet. VIII. Stockholm 1958.
Bruce, F.F.: *The Epistle to the Galatians. A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIC. Exeter 1982.
Burton, Ernest De Witt: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.* ICC. Edinburgh 1921. 1964.
Ebeling, Gerhard: *The Truth of the Gospel. An Exposition of Galatians.* English Translation David Green. Philadelphia 1985.
Guthrie, Donald: *Galatians.* NCB London 1973. 1981.
Koch, L.J.: *Fortolkning til Galaterbrevet.* København 1958.
Lietzmann, Hans: *An die Galater.* HNT 10. Tübingen 1932.
Lightfoot, J.B.: *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* London 1890.1910.
Longenecker, Richard: *Galatians.* WBC 41, Dallas Texas 1990.
Mussner, Franz: *Der Galaterbrief.* HThK IX, Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1974.
Oepke, Albrecht: *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater.* ThHK IX. 3.Aufl. Berlin 1973.
Ridderbos, Herman N.: *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia.* NLC. London 1961. 1976.
Rohde, Joachim: *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater.* ThHK IX. Berlin 1989.
Schlier, Heinrich: *Der Brief an die Galater.* KEK VII. 14. Aufl. Göttingen 1971.

Aagaard, Anna Marie, 1974: The Holy Spirit in the World, *StTh* 28, p.153-171.
--- 1991: *Identifikation af kirken.* Frederiksberg.
Aageson, James W., 1986, Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9-11. *CBQ* 48, p.265-89.
--- 1987: Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9-11. *JSNT* 31, p.51-72.
Aland, Kurt, 1963: *Die Säuglingstaufe im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche. Eine Antwort an Joachim Jeremias.* 2. Aufl. TEH 86, München.
Alexander, T. Desmond, 1983: Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision. *JSOT* 25, p.17-22.
Allegro, John M., 1956: *The Dead Sea Scrolls.* Harmondsworth.
Allison. Dale C., 1987: Jesus and the Covenant. A Response to E.P. Sanders. *JSNT* 29, p.57-78.
Alon, Gedalyahu, 1977: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World. Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud.* Jerusalem.
Andrè, G. and H. Ringgren, 1986: מָמָא, *TDOT* V, p.330-42.

Bächli, Otto, 1962: *Israel und die Völker. Eine Studie zum Deutoronomium.* ATANT 41, Zürich, Stuttgart.
Backhaus, Knut, 1991: *Die "Jüngerkreise" des Täufers Johannes.* PaThST 19, Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich.
Baltzer, Klaus, 1960: *Das Bundesformular.* WMANT 4, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
Bamberger, Bernard J.,1968: *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period.* New York.
Bammel, Ernst, 1959-60: Gottes *ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* (Gal III,15-17) und das jüdische Rechtsdenken. *NTS* 6, p.313-19.
--- 1971/72: The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition. *NTS* 18, p.95-128.
--- 1983: Paulus, der Moses des neuen Bundes. *ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ* 54, p.399-408.
Banks, Robert, 1980: *Paul's Idea of Community. The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting.* Exeter.
Barclay, John M.G., 1988: *Obeying the Truth. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians.* Edinburgh.
Bardtke, Hans, 1968: Qumran und seine Probleme. *ThR* 33, p.97-236.
--- 1973: Literaturbericht über Qumran VII. *TR* 38, p.257-91.
--- 1974: Literaturbericht über Qumran VIII *TR* 39, p.189-221.
--- 1975: Literaturbericht über Qumran IX *TR* 40, p.210-26.
--- 1976: Literaturbericht über Qumran X *TR* 41, p.97-140.
Barker, Margaret, 1991: *The Gate of Heaven. The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem.* London.
Barnett, P.W., 1984: Opposition in Corinth, *JSNT* 22, p.3-17.
Barr, James, 1961: *The Semantics of Biblical Language.* Oxford.
--- 1977: Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant. In *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie.* FS für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart, Rudolf Smend. Göttingen, p.23-38.
Barrett, C.K, 1970-71: Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians. *NTS* 17, p.233-54.
--- 1976: The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians. In *Rechtfertigung.* FS: für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pöhlmann und Peter Stuhlmacher. Tübingen, Göttingen, p.1-16.
--- 1985: *Freedom and Obligation. A Study Of the Epistle to the Galatians.* London.
Barth, Gerhard, 1981: *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit.* Neukirchen-Vluyn.
Barth, Marcus, 1951: *Die Taufe - ein Sakrament?* Zürich.
--- 1976: Baptism. *IDB,* Suppl Vol, p.85-89.
Barton, Stephen C, 1992: The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity: A Critical Survey of the Field. *JTS* 43, p.399-427.
Baumbach, Günther, 1979: "Volk Gottes" im Frühjudentum. Eine Untersuchung der "ekklesiologischen" Typen des Frühjudentums. *Kairos* 21, p.30-47.
Baumgarten, Joseph M., 1953: Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls. *HThR* 46, p.141-57. Repr. in *Studies in Qumran Law.* Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity

24. Leiden 1977, p.39-56.
--- 1957: On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa. *JBL* 76, p.266-69. Reprinted in *Studies in Qumran Law.* Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24. Leiden 1977, p.183-86.
--- 1977: The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity. In *Studies in Qumran Law.* Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24. Leiden, p.88-97.
Beale, C.K., 1989: The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1. *NTS* 35, p.550-81.
Beasley-Murray, G.R., 1962.1976: *Baptism in the New Testament.* Exeter.
Becker, Jürgen, 1972: *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth.* Neukirchen-Vluyn.
Behm, J., 1964: διαθήκη, B, *TDNT* II, p.124-34.
--- 1965: καρδία, *TDNT* III, p.611-13.
--- and E. Würthwein, 1967: μετάνοια, *TDNT* IV, p.976-1006.
Beker, J. Christiaan, 1980. *Paul the Apostle. The Triumph of God in Life and Thought.* Edinburgh.
--- 1990: Romans 9-11 in the Context of the Early Church. *PSB Suppl Issue* 1, p.40-55.
Bellah, Robert N.: *Beyond Belief,* 1970*: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World,* New York.
Belleville, Linda L., 1990: *Reflections of Glory.* Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses - Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3,1-18. *JSNTS* 52. Sheffield.
Bentzen, Aage, 1948: On the Ideas of "the old" and "the new" in Deutero-Isaiah. *StTh* 1, p.183-87.
Berger, Klaus, 1966: Abraham in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen. *MThZ* 17, p.47-89.
--- 1977: Almosen für Israel. *NTS* 23, p.180-204.
--- 1988: Kirche, *TRE* 18, p.199-218.
Berner, Wolf Dietrich, 1972: *Initiationsriten in Mysterienreligionen, im Gnostizismus und im antiken Judentum.* Diss. Göttingen.
Best, Thomas F, 1983: The Sociological Study of the New Testament: Promise and Peril of a New Discipline. *SJTh* 36, p.181-94.
Betz, Hans Dieter, 1974: Geist, Freiheit und Gesetz. *ZThK* 71, p.78-93.
--- 1975: The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. *NTSA* 21, 352-75.
Betz, Otto, 1958-9: Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament. *RdQ* 1, p.213-34. Reprinted in *Aufsätze zur biblischer Theologie II: Jesus der Herr der Kirche.* WUNT 52, Tübingen 1990.
--- 1978: Rechtfertigung und Heilung, in *Rechtfertigung, Realismus, Universalismus in Biblischer Sicht.* FS: für Adolf Köberle zum 80. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Gotthold Müller. Darmstadt, p 30-44.
--- 1980: Beschneidung. *TRE* 5, p.716-22.
Beyer, Hermann, 1964: διακονέω, *TDNT* II, p.81-93.
Black, Matthew, 1961: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins. Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament.* London, Edinburgh, Paris, Melbourne, Johannesburg.
Blidstein, Gerald, 1972-75: 4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte. *RdQ* 8, p.431-35.
Böcher, Otto, 1978: Johannes der Täufer in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung. In *Rechtfertigung- Realismus- Universalismus in biblischer Sicht.* FS Adolf Köberle. Hrsg. Gotthold Müller. Darmstadt.
--- 1988: Johannes der Täufer. *TRE* 17, p.172-81.
Bonhoefer, Dietrich, 1966, 1972: *The Way to Freedom. Letters, Lectures and Notes 1935-1939 from the Collected Works,* Vol II. Ed. and introduced by Edwin H. Robertson. London, New York.
Bonsirven, Joseph, 1964: *Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Christ.* New York.
Borgen, Peder, 1982: Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men, in *Paul and Paulinism.* Ed. M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson. Essays in Honour of C.K. Barrett, London, p.37-46,
Bossman, David M., 1988: Images of God in the Letters of Paul. *BTB* 18,

p.67-75.
Bouttier, Michel, 1976-77: Complexio oppositorum. Sur les formules de I Cor XII.13; Gal III.26-8; Col.III.1o.11. *NTS* 23, p.1-19.
Bouwman, Gijs, 1987: Die Hagar- und Sara- Perikope (Gal 4,21-31). Exemplarische Interpretation zum Schriftbeweis bei Paulus. *ANRW* II 25,4, p.3135-3155.
Braaten, Carl E. and Robert W. Jenson (eds.), 1984: *Christian Dogmatics.* Vol 2. Philadelphia.
Brandt, Wilhelm, 1910: *Die jüdische Baptismen, oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums.* Giessen.
Braumann, Georg, 1962: *Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus.* BWANT 82, Stuttgart.
Braun, Herbert, 1957: *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalis mus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte. Erster Band: Das Spätjudentum.* BHTh 24.I. Tübingen. Repr. 1969.
--- 1959: Römer 7,7-25 und das Selbsverständnis des Qumran-Frommen. *ZThK* 56, p.1-18.
--- 1966: *Qumran und das Neue Testament* I-II. Tübingen.
Braybrooke, Marcus, 1990: *Time to Meet. Towards a deeper relationship between Jews and Christians.* London, Philadelphia.
Brooke, George J., 1989: The Temple Scroll and the New Testament. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.181-199.
Brooks, Oscar S., 1978: A Contextual Interpretation of Galatians 3,27. *Studia Biblica 1978* III, p.47-56.
Brownlee, W. H. 1958: John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls. In *The Scrolls and the New Testament.* Ed. Krister Stendahl. London p.33-53.
--- 1972: Anthropology and Soteriology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament. In *The Use of the Old Testa ment in the New and Other Essays.* Studies in Honor of William Stinespring. Ed. James M. Efud. Durham NC, p.210-40.
--- 1982: The Ceremony of Crossing The Jordan in the annual Covenanting at Qumran. In *Von Kanaan bis Kerala.* FS J.P.M. van der Ploeg, zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979. Hrsg. W.C. Delsman, J.T. Nelis, J.R.T.M. Peters, W.H.Ph. Römer und A.S. van der Wounde.AOAT. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
Bruce, F.F., 1956: *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls,* London.
--- 1966-68: Holy Spirit on the Qumran Texts. *ALUOS* 6, p.49-55.
Brueggemann, Walter, 1983: Trajectories in Old Testament Literature and the Sociology of Ancient Israel. In *The Bible and Liberation.* Ed. Norman K. Gottwald. New York, p.307-333.
Büchler, Adolph, 1926: Studies in The Book of Jubilees, *REV* 82, p.253-74.
--- 1930: Traces des Idées et des coutumes hellénistiques dans le livre des Jubilés. *REJ* 89, p.321-48.
Bultmann, Rudolf, 1972: *The History of the Synoptic Tradition.* ET John Marsh. Revised ed. Oxford.
Burrows, Millar, 1958: *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* London.
Byskov, Martha, 1981: "...fra herlighed til herlighed". *PrBlad* 71, p.813-27.

Callaway, Phillip R., 1988: *The History of the Qumran Community. An Investigation. JSPsS* 3. Sheffield.
--- n.d.: The Calendar Tradition at Qumran. Unpubl. Manuscript.
Campbell, J.Y., 1932: *KOINΩNIA* and its Cognates in the New Testament, *JBL* 51, p.352-80.
Campbell, William S., 1991: *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context. Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans.* Studien zur Interkulturellen Geschichte des Christentums 69. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris.
Caquot, André, 1965: Pour une etude de l'initiation dans l'ancien Israel. In *Initiation.* Ed. C.J. Bleeker. Leiden, p.119-133.

Carmignac, Jean, 1977: II Corinthiens III.6,14 et le début de la formation du nouveau testament. *NTS* 24, p.384-6.
Carroll, Robert P., 1981: *From Chaos to Covenant. Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah.* London.
Catchpole, David R., 1992: The Beginning of Q: A Proposal. *NTS* 38, p.205-21.
Cerfaux, Lucien, 1954: Le privilège d'Israël selon Sain Paul. In *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Études d'Exégèse et Histoire Religieuse* II. BEThL 6-7, p.339-364.
Chester, Andrew, 1988: Citing the Old Testament. In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture.* Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, Ed. D. A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge.
Christiansen, Ellen Juhl, 1981: Women and Baptism, *StTh* 35, p.1-8.
--- 1986: Taufe als Initiation in der Apostelgeschichte. *StTh* 40, p.55-79.
Cohen, Shaye J.D., 1983: Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism. *Conservative Judaism* 36, p.31-45.
--- 1989: Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew. *HThR* 82, p.13-33.
--- 1990: The Rabbinic Conversion Ceremony. *JJS* 41, 1990, p.177-203.
Collange, J.-F., 1972: *Enigmes de la deuxième épître de Paul aux Corinthiens.* SNTS Monograph Series 18, Cambridge.
Collins, John J., 1986: *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* New York.
Collins, Raymond F., 1963: The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the New Testament. *EThL* 39, p.555-94.
Conrad, J., 1986: גרב, *ThWAT* V, col.237-245.
Conzelmann, H. und A. Lindemann, 1979: *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Tübingen.
Cope, Lamar, 1990: First Corinthians 8-10. Continuity or Contradiction? *Angl Theol Rev, Suppl Ser* 11, p.114-23.
Cott, Jeremy, 1984: The Biblical Problem of Election. *JES* 21, p.199-228.
Cross, Frank Moore, 1958: *The Ancient Library of Qumran, and Modern Biblical Studies.* London.
Cullmann, Oscar, 1950: *Baptism in the New Testament.* London.
--- 1955: The significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity. *JBL* 74, p.213-26. Reprinted in *The Scrolls and the New Testament.* Ed. Krister Stendahl. London 1958, p.18-32.
Cuming, G.J., 1981: *ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ* (I Corinthians 12,13) *NTS* 27, p.283-85.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup, 1950: Der Name Israel I. Zur Auslegung von Gal 6,16. *Jud* 6, p.161-170.
--- 1955: The Origin of Baptism. *NTT* 56, p.36-52. (Also in *Interpretationes as Vetus Testamentum Pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel Septua genario Missae.)*
--- 1956: Misjonsteologien i Romerbrevet. *NTM* 10, p.44-60. Reprinted in *Studies in Paul.* Minneapolis 1977, p.70-94.
--- 1963: *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums.* 2.Aufl. Darmstadt.
--- 1967: Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21. In *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox.* Ed. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule and R.R. Niebuhr. Cambridge, p.313-35.
--- 1968: The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts. In *Studies in Luke-Acts.* Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert. Eds. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. London, p.139-58.
--- 1975: The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology. *Reflection* 73, p.5-8.
--- 1976: *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church.* Minneapolis.
--- 1977: Promise and Fulfillment, in *Studies in Paul,* Minneapolis, p.121-36.
--- 1977: The Future of Israel, in *Studies in Paul,* Minneapolis, p.137-58.
--- 1977: Contradictions in Scripture, *Studies in Paul,* Minneapolis, p.159-77.

--- 1978: Review of E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, *RSR* 4, p.153-58.
--- 1983: Trinitariske dåpsbekjennelser og nytestamentlig teologi. *SEA* 48, p.118-43.
Dalton, William J., 1987: Is the Old Covenant Abrogated (2 Cor 3.14)? *ABR* 35, p.88-94
Davenport, Gene L., 1971: *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees.* StPB 20, Leiden.
Davies, Philip R., 1982: The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document. *JJS* 33, p.287-302.
--- 1983: *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document".* JSOTS 25. Sheffield.
--- 1987: *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Brown Judaic Studies 94. Atlanta,Georgia.
--- 1989: The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.201-10.
--- 1990: The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is "Damascus"? *RdQ* 14, p.503-19.
Davies, W.D, 1952: *Torah in the Messianic Age and /or the Age to Come.* JBL Monograph Series 7, Philadelphia.
--- 1977: Paul and the People of Israel, *NTS* 24, p.4-39.
--- 1982: *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism.* Berkeley. Repr. 1991.
--- 1984: *Jewish and Pauline Studies.* London.
de Beauvoir, Simone, 1972. 1979: *The Second Sex.* Harmondsworth.
Delcor, M., 1963: Das Bundesfest in Qumran und das Pfingstfest. *BiLe* 4, p.188-204.
--- 1963: Le vocabulaire juridique, cultuel et mystique de l'"initiation" dans la secte de Qumrân. In Hans Bardkte, Hrsg: *Qumran Probleme.* Berlin p.109-34.
--- 1967-69: Repas cultuels essénniens et thérapeutes, thiases et haburoth. *RdQ* 6, p.401-25.
Delling, Gerhard, 1963: *Die Taufe im Neuen Testament.* Berlin.
--- 1970: Geprägte partizipiale Gottesaussagen in dert urchristliche Verkündigung. In *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1959-1968.* Hrsg. Ferdinand Hahn, Traugott Holz, Nicolaus Walter, p.401-16.
Derrett, J.Duncan M., 1991: "Circumcision and Perfection". A Johannine Equation (John 7,22-23), *EQ* 63, p.211-24.
Dexinger, Ferdinand, 1982: Erwählung II, *TRE* 10, p.189-92.
Dietzel, Armin, 1957: Beten im Geist. *ThZ* 13, p.12-32.
Dinkler, Erich, 1962: Taufe. *RGG* 6, col.627-37.
--- 1967: *Signum Crucis*, Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Christlichen Archäologie. Tübingen.
--- 1971: Die Taufaussagen des Neuen Testamenents, in *Zu Karl Barths Lehre von der Taufe.* Hrs. F. Viering. Gütersloh, p.60-153.
Douglas, Mary, 1966.1984: *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* London, Boston, Melbourne, Henly.
Dulles, Avery, 1988: *Models of the Church.* 2.ed., Dublin.
Dunn, James D.G., 1970: 2 Corinthians III.17 - 'The Lord is the Spirit'. *JTS* 21, p.309-20.
--- 1970: *Baptism in the Holy Spirit. A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today.* London.
--- 1975: *Jesus and the Spirit. A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament. London.*
--- 1977: *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. An Inquiry into the Character of the Earliest Christianity.* London.
--- 1977-78: 'The Birth of a Metaphor- Baptized in Spirit. *ET* 89, p.134-38. 173-5.

--- 1983: The New Perspective on Paul, *BJRL* 65, p.95-122. Reprinted in *Jesus, Paul and the Law.* London 1990, p.183-214.
--- 1985, Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14), *NTS* 31, p.523-42. Reperinted in *Jesus, Paul and the Law.* London 1990, p.215-41.
--- 1987: Paul's Epistle to the Romans: An Analysis of Structure and Argument. *ANRW* II 25,4, p.2842-90.
--- 1987: *The Living Word.* London.
--- 1988: The Theology of Galatians, *SBL Seminar Papers*, p.1-16. Reprinted in *Jesus, Paul and the Law.* London 1990, p.241-64.
--- 1990: *Jesus, Paul and the Law. Studies in Mark and Galatians.* London.
--- 1991: *The Partings of the Ways. Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity.* London.
--- 1991: What was the Issue between Paul and "Those of the Circumcision"? In, *Paulus und das antike Judentum.* Hrsg Martin Hengel- Ulrich Heckel. Tübingen Durham Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters (†19.Mai 1938). Tübingen, p.295-312.
Dupont, J., 1949: Le chrétien, miroir de la gloire divine d'après II Cor. III,18. *RB* 56, p.392-411.
Dupont-Sommer, André, 1965: Schuld und Reinigungsriten in der jüdischen Sekte von Qumran. *Semitica* 15, p.61-70. Reprinted in *Qumran*, Hrsg. Karl Erich Grözinger, Wege der Forschung 410, Darmstadt 1981, p.263-75.
Dussel, Enrique, 1986: *Ethics and Community.* Liberation and Theology 3, Maryknoll NY.

Eckert, Jost, 1982: Erwählung III, *TRE* 10, p.192-97.
Eichrodt, Walther, 1961-1967: *Theology of the Old Testament.* Vol 1-2, London.
Eising, H., 1980: זכר, *TDOT* IV, p.64-82.
Elgvin, Torleif, 1985: The Qumran Covenant Festival and the Temple Scroll. *JJS* 36, p.103-6.
Eliade, Mircea, 1958. 1975: *Rites and Symbols of Initiation. The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth*, New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London.
--- 1959: Initiation, *RGG*^{3} III, col.751-53.
Ellis, E.E., 1977: How the New Testament Uses the Old. In *New Testament Interpretation*, Ed. I.H. Marshall. Exeter, p.199-219.
--- 1989: *Pauline Theology. Ministry and Society.* Michigan, Exeter.
Endres, John C., 1987: *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees.* CBQ Monograph Series 18, Washington.
Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, 1988: Skriften på hjertets tavle. En metafors udvikling fra Det Gamle Testamente til Paulus. In *Det gamle Testamente og den kristne fortolkning.* Forum for bibelsk eksegese 1. Red. Karin Friis Plum; Geert Hallbäck. København, p.85-116.
Epp, Eldon Jay, 1986: Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1-5). *HThR* 79, p.80-89. Also *Christans Among Jews and Gentiles.* FS: Krister Stendahl. Philadelphia.
Ernst, Josef, 1984: Öffnet die Türen dem Erlöser. Johannes der Täufer - seine Rolle in der Heilsgeschichte. *ThGL* 74, p.137-65.
--- 1989: *Johannes der Täufer. Interpretation- Geschichte- Wirkungsgeschichte.* BZNW 53.Berlin, New York.
--- 1989: War Jesus ein Schüler Johannes' des Täufers. In *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus.* FS Joachim Gnilka. Hrsg. Hubert Frankemölle, Karl Kertelge. Freiburg, Basel, Wien p.13-33.

Fabry, Heinz-Josef, 1975: *Die Wurzel SUB in der Qumran-literatur.* Köln, Bonn.
--- 1983: "Gedenken" im Alten Testament. In *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie.* Hrsg. Josef Schreiner. Stuttgart, p.177-87.
--- 1984: לב, *ThWAT* IV, p.413-51.
--- 1990: יחד, *TDOT* VI, p.40-48.
Fensham, F. Charles, 1971: Father and Son Terminology for Treaty and Covenant. In *Near Eastern Studies.* In Honor of William Foxwell Albright.

Ed. Hans Goediche. Baltimore, London, p.121-35.
Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüsssler, 1976: Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT. *CBQ* 38, p.159-77.
--- 1983: *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins.* London.
Fitzgerald, Aloysius, 1974: MTNDBYM in 1QS. *CBQ* 36, p.495-502.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 1981: Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7-4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif, *TS* 42, p.630-44.
Flemington, W.F., 1948: *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism.* London Repr. 1953.
--- 1962: Baptism. *IDB* I, p.348-53.
Flusser, David, 1983: Die Sakramente und das Judentum. *Jud* 39, p.3-18.
--- 1988: *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity.* Jerusalem.
Fohrer, Georg, 1968: *Die Symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten.* ATANT 54, 2. Aufl. Zürich, Stuttgart.
Ford, J. Massyngbaerde, 1975, *Revelation. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary.* AncB 38. Garden City New York 1975.
Forkman, Göran, 1972: *The Limits of the Religious Community. CB* 5, Lund.
Forshey, Harold O., 1973: Circumcision: An Initiatory Rite in Ancient Israel. *Rest Quart* 16, p.150-58.
Fox, Michael V., 1974: The Sign of the Covenant. Circumcision in the light of the priestly *'ôt* Etiologies. *RB* 81, p.557-596.
Frankemölle, Hubert, 1984: Juden und Christen nach Paulus. *ThGl* 74, p.59-80.
Friedrich, Gerhard, 1963: Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. In *Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel.* FS: Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, Peter Schmidt, AGSU 5, Leiden, p.181-215.
Fuchs, Albert, 1976: Intention und Addressaten der Busspredigt des Täufers bei Mt 3,7-10. In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche.* SNTU 1. p.62-75.
Fuhs, H.F., 1986: עבר, *ThWAT* V, col.1015-1033.
Fuller, Reginald H., 1976: Christian Initiation in the New Testament. In *Made, Not Born. New Perspectives on Christian Initiation and the Catechumenate.* From the Murphy Center for Liturgical Research. Notre Dame, London, p.7-31.

Gager, John G., 1975: *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity.* London.
Galling, Kurt, 1928: *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels.* BZAV 48, Giesen.
Gandz, Solomon, 1954: The Calendar of Ancient Israel. In *Homenaje a Millás-Vallicrosa.* Vol I. Barcelona, p.623-46.
Garnet, Paul, 1977: *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls.* Tübingen.
Gaston, Lloyd, 1970: *No Stone on Another. Studies in the significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels.* Leiden.
--- 1982: Israel's Enemies in Pauline Theology. *NTS* 28, p.400-23.
Gavin, F., 1928: *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments.* London.
Gennep, Arnold van, 1909: *Les rites des passage.* Paris.
Georgi, Dieter, 1987: *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians.* Edinburgh.
Gerhardson, Birger, 1987: Eleuteria ('freedom') in the Bible. In *Scripture: Meaning and Method.* Essays presented to Anthony Tyrrell Hanson for his seventieth birthday. Ed. Barry Thompson. Hull, p.3-23.
Gerlitz, Peter, 1987: Initiation/Initiationsriten. *TRE* 16, p.156-62.
Gese, Hartmut, 1964: Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung. *ZThK* 61, p.10-26.
Getty, Mary Ann, 1987: Paul on the Covenants and the Future of Israel. *BTB* 17, p.92-99.
--- 1988: Paul and the Salvation of Israel: A Perspective on Romans 9-11. *CBQ* 50, p.456-69.
Ginzberg, Louis, 1925. 1955: *The Legends of the Jews 5.* Philadelphia.
Gnilka, Joachim, 1961: Das Gemeinschaft der Essener. *BZ* 5, p.39-55.
--- 1961-62: Die Essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe. *RdQ* 3, p.185-207.

Goettsberger, J., 1924: Die Hülle des Moses nach Ex 34 und 2 Kor 3. *BZ* 16, p.1-17.
Goguel, Maurice, 1928: *Au Seuil de l'évangile Jean-Baptiste. La Tradition sur Jean-Baptiste. Le Baptême de Jésus. Jésus et Jean-Baptiste. Histoire de Jean-Baptiste.* Paris.
--- 1960: *Jesus and the Origins of Christianity.* Vol 1-2. New York.
Golb, Norman, 1990: Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judaean Wilderness: Observations on the Logic of their Investigation. *JNES* 49, p.103-114.
Goppelt, Leonhard, 1954: *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche.* BFChTh.M 55. Gütersloh.
--- 1969: *Typos. Die Typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen.* Darmstadt.
Gordon, T. David, 1987: The Problem at Galatia. *Interp* 41, p.32-43.
Gorman, Frank H., 1990: The Ideology of Ritual. Space Time and Status in the Priestly Theology. JSOT Suppl. Ser. 91. Sheffield.
Gottwald, Norman K, 1979: *The Tribes of Yahweh. A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250- 1050 BCE.* London.
--- (ed.), 1983: *The Bible and Liberation. Political and Social Hermeneutics.* New York.
Gräßer, Erich, 1985: *Der Alte Bund im Neuen. Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament.* WUNT 35, Tübingen, p.1-134.
Grech, Prosper, 1955: 2 Corinthians 3,17 and the Pauline Doctrine of Conversion to the Holy Spirit. *CBQ* 17, p.420-37.
Greenwood, D., 1972: The Lord is the Spirit: Some Considerations of 2 Cor 3:17. *CBQ* 34, p.467-72.
Grelot, P., 1987: Note sur 2 Corinthiens 3,14. *NTS* 33, p.135-44.
Griffiths, D.R., 1943-44: 'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Corinthians 3:17,18) *ExpT* 55, p.81-83.
Grobel, Kendrick, 1964: A Chiastic Retribution-formula in Romans 2. In *Zeit und Geschichte.* Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Hrsg Erich Dinkler. Tübingen p.255-261.

Haag, Herbert, 1967: Das liturgische Leben der Qumrangemeinde. *ALW* X, p.78-109.
Hafemann, Scott J., 1992, The Glory and Veil of Moses in 2 Cor 3:7-14: An Example of Paul's Contextual Exegesis of the OT - A Proposal. *HBT* 14, p.131-49.
Halter, Hans, 1977: *Taufe und Ethos. Paulinische Kriterien für das Proprium christlicher Moral.* FThSt 106. Freiburg, Basel, Wien.
Hansen, Knud, 1978: *Den kristne Tro.* Copenhagen.
Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell, 1980: The Midrash in II Corinthians 3: A Reconsideration. *JSNT* 9, p.2-28.
--- 1983: *The Living Utterances of God. The New Testament Exegesis of the Old.* London.
Hanssen, Ove Conrad, 1987: *Handspåleggelsens funksjon ved kristen initiasjon i Apostlenes Gjerninger.* Lund.
Hardy, Daniel W., 1989: Created and Redeemed Society. In *On Being the Church. Essays on Christian Community.* Ed. Colin E. Gunton and Daniel W. Hardy. Edinburgh, p.21-47.
Harrington, Daniel J, 1988: Second Testament Exegesis and the Social Sciences: A Bibliography. *BTB* 18, 1988, p.77-85.
Harris, J.G., 1967: The Covenant Concept Among the Qumran Sectaries. *EvQ* 39, p.86-92.
Harrisville, R.A., 1955: The Concept of Newness in the New Testament. *JBL* 74, p.69-79.
Hartman, Lars, 1973-74: 'Into the Name of Jesus'. *NTS* 20, p.432-40.
--- 1974: Baptism "Into the Name of Jesus" and Early Christology. *StTh* 28, p.21-48.
--- 1976: Taufe, Geist und Sohnschaft, in *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche.* SNTU 1, p.89-109.

--- 1979: *Asking for a Meaning. A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5.* CB 12. Lund.
--- 1980: Bundesideologie in und hinter einigen paulinischen Texten. In *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie.* Hrsg. Sigfred Pedersen, Århus Göttingen p.103-118.
--- 1992: Baptism *AnBD* I, p.583-594.
--- 1992: *Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus. Die Taufe in den neutestamentlichen Schriften.*SBS 148. Stuttgart.
Hays, Richard B., 1989: *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven, London.
Hayward, Robert, 1978: Phinehas- the same is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition. *JJS* 29, p.22-34.
--- 1981: The Present State of Research into the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac. *JJS* 32, p.127-150.
Heffner, Philip J., 1984: The Church. In *Christian Dogmatics.* Vol 2. Eds. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson. Philadelphia, p.179-247.
Hellwig, Monika, 1970: Christian Theology and the Covenant of Israel. *JES* 7, p.37-51
Hengel, Martin, 1978: Qumran und der Hellenismus, in *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu.* Ed. M. Delcor. BEThL 46. Paris, Gembloux, Leuven, p.333-72.
--- 1981: *Judaism and Hellenism.* Vol 1-2. London.
Hengel, M., J.H. Charlesworth, D. Mendels, 1986: The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple. *JJS* 37, p.28-38.
Hengel, Martin in collaboration with Roland Deines, 1991: *The Pre-Christian Paul.* London.
Hermann, Ingo, 1961: *Kyrios und Pneuma. Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen Hauptbriefe.* SANT 2, München.
Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen, 1965: *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. Zur "spiritualisierung" der Kultbegriffe im Alten Testament.* WMANT 19. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
--- 1983: Bund und Erwählung. In *Altes Testament.* Hrsg. Hans Jochen Boecker, Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, Johann Michael Schmidt, Ludwig Schmidt. Neukirchener Arbeitsbücher. Neukirchener, p.222-243.
Hickling, C.J.A., 1975: The Sequence of Thought in II Corinthians, Chapter Three. *NTS* 21, p.380-95.
--- 1990: Baptism in the First-Century Churches: A Case for Caution. In *The Bible in Three Dimensions.* Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield. Ed. David J.A. Clines, Stephen E. Fowl, Stanley E. Porter. JSOTS 87, Sheffield, p.249-67.
Hill, David, 1979: Jesus and Josephus' 'messianic prophets'. In *Text and Interpretation. Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black.* Ed. Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge, p.143-54.
Hillers, Delbert R., 1974: *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea.* 4. impr. Baltimore, London.
Hindley, J.C., 1962: The Meaning and Translation of Covenant. *BiTr* 13, p.90-101.
Hoenig, Sidney B., 1967-69: Qumran Rules of Impurities. *RdQ* 6, p.559-67.
Hofius, Otfried, 1979: Gesetz und Evangelium nach 2. Korinther 3, *Paulus-studien.* WUNT 51, Tübingen, p.75-120.
--- 1979: Wort Gottes und Glaube bei Paulus. *Paulusstudien,* WUNT 51, Tübingen, p.148-74.
Hollenbach, Paul W., 1979: Social Aspects of John the Baptizer's Preaching Mission in the Context of Palestinian Judaism. *ANRW* 2,19,2, p.850-75.
--- 1992: John the Baptist, *AnBD* III, p.887-99.
Holmberg, Bengt, 1978: *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Christian Churches as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles.* CB, NT series 12.
--- 1990:*Sociology and the New Testament. An Appraisal.* Minneapolis.
Hooker, Morna, 1969-70: John the Baptist and the Johannine Prologue. *NTS* 16, p.354-58.
--- 1981: Beyond the Things that are Written? St Paul's Use of Scripture.

NTS 27, p.295-309. Repr. in *From Adam to Christ. Essays on Paul.* Cambridge 1990. p.139-154.
--- 1982: Paul and "Covenantal Nomism". In *Paul and Paulinism.* FS: C.K. Barrett. Eds. M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson.London, p.47-56. Repr. in *From Adam to Christ. Essays on Paul.* Cambridge 1990. p.155-164.
--- 1986: *Continuity and Discontinuity. Early Christianity in its Jewish Setting.* London.
Hovda, Robert W., 1976: Hope for the Future: A Summary. In *Made, Not Born. New Perspectives on Christian Initiation and the Catechumenate.* From the Murphy Center for Liturgical Research. Notre Dame, London, p.152-67.
Howard, George, 1979: *Paul: Crisis in Galatia. A Study in Early Christian Theology.* SNTS Monograph Series 35, Cambridge.
Hübner, Hans, 1984: *Gottes Ich und Israel.* FRLANT 136. Göttingen.
--- 1984: *Law in Paul's Thought.* Edinburgh.
Hughes, John J., 1979: Hebrews IX 15ff and Galatians III,15ff. A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure. *NT* 21, p.27-96.
Hultgren, Arland J., 1976: Covenant Consciousness and Social Conscience in Biblical Perspective. *LuthQ* 28, p.30-44.
Huntjens, Johannes A., 1972-75: Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran. *RdQ* 8, p.361-80.
Huppenbauer, Hanswalter, 1957: רבים, רוב, רב in der Sektenregel (1QS). *ThZ* 13, p.136-37.
Hyatt, J.P., 1962: Circumcision. *IDB* I, p.629-31.
Højen, Peder, 1977: Tro og Dåb. *Lumen* 58-59, 20. årg.

Ilg, Norbert, 1978: Überlegungen zum Verständnis von ברית in den Qumrântexten. In *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu.* Ed. M. Delcor. BEThL 46. Paris, Gembloux, Leuven, p.257-63.
Isaac, Erich, 1964: Circumcison as a Covenant Rite, *Anthr* 59, p.444-56.

Janowski, Bernd; Hermann Lichtenberger, 1983: Enderwartung und Reinheitsidee. Zur eschatologischen Deutung von Reinheit und Sühne in der Qumrangemeinde. *JJS* 34, p.31-62.
Jaubert, Annie, 1963: *La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne.* PatSor 6, Paris.
Jenson, Philip Peter, 1992: *Graded Holiness. A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World.* JSOT Sup ser 106. Sheffield.
Jenson, Robert W., 1976: The Mandate and Promise of Baptism. *Interp* 30, p.271-87.
--- 1984: The Sacraments. In *Christian Dogmatics.* Vol 2. Eds. Carl Braaten and Robert W. Jenson. Philadelphia.
Jeppesen, Knud, 1986: Den nye pagt i Det gamle Testamente og den antike jødedom. In *Judendom och kristendom under de första århundradena.* Nordisk patristikerprojekt 1982-85, vol 1. Stavanger, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø, p.68-84.
Jeremias, Gert, 1963: *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit.* StUNT 2, Göttingen.
Jeremias, Joachim, 1949: Proselytentaufe und Neues Testament. *ThZ* 5, p.419-28.
--- 1958: Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen. *ZNW* 49, p.145-156.
--- 1960.1964: *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries.* London.
--- 1962: *Nochmals: Die Anfänge der Kindertaufe.* TEH 101. München.
--- 1969: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and social Conditions during the New Testament Period.* London.
Jervell, Jacob, 1960: *Imago Dei. Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen.* FRLANT 76, Göttingen.
--- 1972-73: Den omskårne Messias, *SEA* 37-38, p.145-155.
--- 1977: Das Volk des Geistes. In *God's Christ and his People. Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl.* Ed. Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks. Oslo, p.87-106.
Jeske, Richard L., 1980: The Rock was Christ: The Ecclesiology os 1 Corinthians 10. In *Kirche.* FS für Günther Bornkam zum 75. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Dieter Lührmann und Georg Strecker. Tübingen, p.245-255.

Jewett, Robert, 1985: The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans. *Interp* 39, p.341-56.
Johnson, Dan G., 1984: The Structure and Meaning of Romans 11. *CBQ* 46, p.91-103.
Judge, E.A., 1960: *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century.* London.

Kamlah, Ehrhard, 1954: Buchstabe und Geist. Die Bedeutung deieser Antithese für die alttestamentliche Exegese des Apostels Paulus. *EvT* 14, p.276-82.
Kapelrud, Arvid S., 1968: Der Bund in den Qumran-schriften. In *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft.* FS: Hans Bardtke. Hrsg. Siegfried Wagner, Berlin, p.137-49.
Käsemann, Ernst, 1942: Die Legitimität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu 2 Korinther 10-13. *ZNW* 41, p.33-71.
--- 1971: The Theological Problem presented by the Motif of the Body of Christ. In *Perspectives on Paul,* p.102-21.
--- 1971: The Spirit and the Letter. In *Perspectives on Paul.* London, p.138-66.
Kaufmann, Yehezkel, 1988: *Christianity and Judaism. Two covenants.* Jerusalem.
Kavanagh, Aidan, 1978: *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation.* New York.
Kazmierski, Carl R., 1987: The Stones of Abraham: John the Baptist and the End of the Torah (Matt 3,7-10 par. Luke 3,7-9). *Bib* 68, p.22-39
Kee, Howard CLark, 1980: *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective. Methods and Resources.* London.
--- 1989: *Knowing the Truth. A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation.* Minneapolis.
Kellermann, D., 1973: גלל, *ThWAT* I, col.979-91.
Kertelge, Karl, 1983: Die "reine Opfergabe". Zum Verständnis des "Opfers" im Neuen Testament. In *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie.* Hrsg. Josef Schreiner. Stuttgart, p.347-60.
Kieffer, René, 1986-87: Judiska reningar och det dop som Jesus kommer med. *SEA* 51-52, p.116-26.
Klaiber, Walter, 1982: *Rechtfertigung und Gemeinde. Eine Untersuchung zum paulinischen Kirchenverständnis.* FRLANT 127, Göttingen.
Klassen, William, 1986: Jesus and Phinehas. A Rejected Model. *SBL 1986 Seminar Papers,* p.490-500.
Klauck, Hans-Josef, 1983: Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus. In *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie.* Hrsg. Josef Schreiner. Stuttgart, p.107-18.
Klein, S., 1934: Palästinisches im Jubiläerbuch. *ZDPV* 57, p.7-27.
Kline, Meredith G., 1964: Law Covenant. *WThJ* 27, p.1-20.
Klinzing, Georg, 1971: *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament.* Göttingen.
Knibb, Michael A., 1983: Exile in the Damascus Document. *JSOT* 25, p.99-117.
Koch, Dietrich-Alex, 1986: *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus.* BHTh 69, Tübingen.
Kremer, Jacob, 1980: "Denn die Buchstabe tötet, der Geist aber macht lebendig". Methodologische und hermeneutische Erwägungen zu 2 Kor 3,6b. In *Begegnung mit dem Wort.* FS: H. Zimmermann, BBB 53, p.210-50.
Kruse, Heinz, 1985: David's Covenant. *VT* 35, p.139-64.
Kuhn, K.G., 1968: προσήλυτος, *TDNT* VI, p.730-44.
Kümmel, Werner Georg, 1948-49: Das Urchristentum. *ThR* 17, p.42-45.
--- 1950: Das Urchristentum. *ThR* 18, p.32-47.
--- 1973: *The Theology of the New Testament According to its Major Witnesses- Jesus- Paul- John.* London.
--- 1980: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* 20.Aufl. Heidelberg.
--- 1986: Das Urchristentum. *ThR* 51, p.239-68.
Kutsch, Ernst, 1961: Der Kalender des Jubiläenbuches und das Alte und das

Neue Testaments. *VT* 11, p.39-47.
--- 1963: *Salbung als Rechtsakt im alten Testament und im alten Orient.* BZAW 87. Berlin.
--- 1971: ברית, *THAT*, I, col.339-52.
--- 1973: *Verheissung und Gesetz. Untersuchungen zum sogenannten "Bund" im Alten Testament.* BZAW 131, Berlin. New York.
--- 1981: Bund, *TRE* 7, p.397-410.

Lambrecht, Jan, 1983: Structure and Line of Thought in 2 Cor 2,14-4,6. *Bib* 64, p.344-80.
--- 1983: Transformation in 2 Cor 3,18. *Bib* 64, p.243-54.
Lampe, G.W.H., 1967: *The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers.* 2.ed. London.
Lang, Friedrich, 1975: Erwägungen zur Eschatologischen Verkündigung Johannes des Täufers. In *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie.* FS Hans Conzelmann. Hrsg. Georg Strecker. Tübingen p.459-73.
--- 1976: Gesetz und Bund bei Paulus. In *Rechtfertigung.* FS: für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pöhlmann und Peter Stuhlmacher. Tübingen, Göttingen, p.305-20.
Lapperrousaz, E.M., 1979: *DB Suppl* 9, cpl.745-98.
Leaney, A.R.C., 1984: *The Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200.* CCWJCW 7, Cambridge.
Le Déaut, R., 1979: Savu'ot och den kristna pingsten i NT. *SEA* 44, p.148-69.
--- 1981: Le thème de la circoncision du coeur (Dt. XXX 6; Jêr. IV 4) dans les versions anciennes (LXX et Targum) et à Qumrân. *VT Suppl* 32, p.178-205.
Lehmann, F.Rudolf, 1957: Bermerkungen zu einer neuen Begründung der Beschneidung. *Sociologus* 7, p.57-74.
Lehne, Susanne, 1990: *The New Covenant in Hebrews.* JSNTS 44. Sheffield.
Levenson, Jon D., 1985: *Sinai and Zion. An Entry into the Jewish Bible.* Minneapolis, Chicago, New York.
Levin, Christoph, 1985: *Die Verheissung des Neuen Bundes in ihren theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt.* FRLANT 137, Göttingen.
Levine, Baruch A., 1978: The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character. *BASOR* 232, p.5-23.
Lichtenberger, Hermann, 1980: Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community. In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* II. Ed. William Scott Green. Brown Judaic Studies 9. Missoula, p.159-71.
--- 1980: *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde.* StUNT 15. Göttingen.
--- 1987: Täufergemeinden und frühchristliche Täuferpolemik im letzten Drittel des 1. Jahrhunderts. *ZThK* 84, p.36-57.
Lieberman, Saul, 1952: The Discipline in the So-called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. *JBL* 71, p.199-206.
Limbeck, Meinrad, 1971: *Die Ordnung des Heils. Untersuchungen zum Gesetzverständniss des Frühjudentums.* Düsseldorf.
Lindars, Barnabas, 1986-87: The Old Testament and Universalism in Paul. *BJRL* 69, p.511-27.
Lindemann, Andreas, 1979: Die Rede von gott in der paulinischen Theologie. *ThGl* 69, p.357-76.
Lindeskog, Gösta, 1983: Johannes der Täufer. Einige Randbemerkungen zum heutigen Stand der Forschung. *ASTI* 12, p.55-83.
Linnemann, Eta, 1973: Jesus und der Täufer. *Festschrift für Ernst Fuchs.* Tübingen p.219-36.
Linton, Olof, 1940: "Gammalt" och !nytt". En studie i nytestamentlig terminologi. *SEA* 5, p.43-55.
Liver, Jacob, 1967-69: The "Sons of Zadok the Priests" in the Dead Sea Sect. *RdQ* 6, p.3-30.
Lohfink, Norbert, 1987: Der Begriff des Gottesreichs vom Alten Testament her gesehen. In *Unterwegs zur Kirche. Alttestamentliche Konzeptionen.* Hrsg. Josef Schreiner. QD 110. Freiburg, Basel, Wien, p.33-86.

--- 1989: *Der niemals gekündigte Bund. Exegetische Gedanken zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch.* Freiburg, Basel, Wien.
--- 1991: Der Begriff "Bund" in der biblischen Theologie. *ThPh* 66, p.161-76.
Loewenstamm, Samuel E., 1968: Zur Traditionsgeschichte des Bundes zwischen den Stücken. *VT* 18, p.500-507.
Lohmeyer, Ernst, 1913: *Diatheke. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des neutestamentlichen Begriffs.* Leipzig.
--- 1932: *Das Urchristentum. 1.Buch. Johannes der Täufer.* Göttingen.
Lüdemann, Gert, 1983: *Paulus und das Judentum.* TEH 215. München.
Lührmann, Dieter, 1975: Wo man nicht mehr Sklave oder Frei ist. Überlegungen zur Struktur frühchristlicher Gemeinden. *WuD* 13, p.53-83.
Lund, Nils Wilhelm, 1942: *Chiasmus in the New Testament.* N. Carolina.
Lundberg, Per, 1942: *La Typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Église. ASNU* X Leipzig. Uppsala.
Luz, Ulrich, 1967: Der alte und der neue Bund bei Paulus und im Hebräerbrief. *EvT* 27, p.318-36.
--- 1968: *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus.* BEvTh 49. München.
Lyonet, S., 1977: (Discussion) In *Die Israelfrage nach Röm 9-11.* Hrsg Lorenzo De Lorenzi. Ben Monographische Reihe 3. Rom.

McCarthy, Dennis J., 1973: *Old Testament Covenant. A Survey of Opinions.* Oxford.
--- 1985: *Institution and Narrative.* Collected Essays. AB 108, Rome.
McCaughey, J. Davis, 1987: The Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ. *ABR* 35, p.95-98.
McCready, Wayne O., 1981: Patterns for Identity in the Damascus Document. In *Proceedings of the Eight World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A,* p.85-90.
--- 1982-84: The Sectarian Status of Qumran: The Temple Scroll. *RdQ* 11, p.183-191.
McCurley, Foster R., 1983: *Ancient Myth and Biblical Faith: Scriptural Transformations.* Philadelphia.
MacDonald, Margaret Y., 1988: *The Pauline Churches. A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings. Cambridge.*
McEleney, Neil J., 1973-74: "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law." *NTS* 20, p.319-41
McGuire, Meredith B., 1991: *Religion: The Social Context.* Third Edition. Belmont
McNamara, Martin, 1983: *Palestinian Judaism and the New Testament.* Wilmington.
Maier, Johann, 1960: Zum Begriff תורה in den Texten von Qumran. *ZAW* 72, p.148-66. Reprinted in *Qumran,* Hrsg. Karl Erich Grözinger, Wege der Forschung 410, Darmstadt 1981, p.225-248.
--- 1989: The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of the Temple Scroll. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.23-62.
Malina, Bruce J., 1981: *The New Testament World. Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* London.
--- 1983: The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation. In *The Bible and Liberation.* Ed. Norman K. Gottwald, New York, p.11-25.
--- 1986: *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation.* Atlanta.
--- 1986: "Religion" in the World of Paul. *BTB* 16, p.92-101.
Manson, T.W., 1953/54: John the Baptist, *BJRL* 36, p.395-412.
--- 1956: *The Servant-Nessiah. A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus.* Cambridge.
Marcus, Joel, 1989: The Circumcision and the Uncircumcision in Rome, *NTS* 35, p.67-81.
Martin, Ralph P., 1984: *The Spirit and the Congregation. Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15.* Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Martin-Achard, R., 1971, גור, THAT I, col.409-12.
Martyn, J. Louis, 1985: A Law-observant Mission to Gentiles: The Background of Galatians. *SJTh* 38, p.307-24.
--- 1985: Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians. *NTS* 31, p.410-24.
--- 1991: The Covenants of Hagar and Sarah. In *Faith and History.* Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer. Ed. John T. Carroll, Charles H. Cosgrove, E. Elizabeth Johnson. Atlanta, GA, p.160-92.
Mayer, G., 1984: מוּל, *ThWAT* IV, col.734-38.
Meeks, Wayne A., 1973-4: The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity. *HR* 13, p.165-208.
--- 1979: "Since Then You Would Not Need To Go Out Of The World": Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity. In *Critical History and Biblical Faith, New Testament Perspectives.* Ed. Thomas J. Ryan. Villanova, p.4-29.
--- 1983: *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul.* New Haven.
Meier, John P., 1992: John the Baptist in Josephus: Philology and Exegesis. *JBL* 111, p.225-237.
Mendenhall, George E., 1954: Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition. *BA* 17, p.50-76.
--- 1962: Covenant, *IDB* I, p.714-23.
Merklein, Helmut, 1990: Gericht und Heil. Zum heilsamen Funktion des GerichtS bei Johannes dem Täufer, Jesus und Paulus. *JBTh* 5: *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung,* p.71-92.
Michaelis, Wilhelm, 1951: Zum jüdischen Hintergrund der Johannestaufe. *Jud* 7, p.81-120.
Mihaly, Eugene, 1964: A Rabbinic Defense of the Election of Israel. An Analysis of Sifre Deuteronomy 32:9, Pisqua 312, *HUCA* 35, p.103-43.
Milgrom, Jacob, 1978: The Temple Scroll. *BA* 41, p.105-20.
--- 1978: Studies in the Temple Scroll. *JBL* 97, p.501-23.
--- 1989: The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.165-180.
Milik, J.T., 1959: *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea.* London.
Minear, Paul S., 1960: *Images of the Church in the New Testament.* Philadelphia.
Mink, Hans Aage, 1979: Præsentation af et ny Qumranskrift: Tempelrullen. *DTT* 42, p.81-112.
Moehring, Horst R., 1984: Joseph ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus. *ANRW* 2,21,2, p.864-944.
Mol, Hans, 1976: *Identity and the Sacred,* New York.
Moore, George Foot, 1940-44: *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim.* Vol I-III. Cambridge.
Morgan, Robert with John Barton, 1988: *Biblical Interpretation.* Oxford.
Mosbech, Holger, 1941: Den apostoliske Trosbekendelse i den nyere Forsknings Lys. In *Talt og Skrevet. Foredrag of Artikler om nytestamentlige Emner.* København, p.103-119.
Moule, Charles F.D., 1972: 2 Cor 3:18b, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. In *Neues Testament und Geschichte.* FS: Oscar Cullmann. Hrsg. Heinrich Baltensweiler, Bo Reicke. Zürich, p.231-37.
Moxnes, Halvor, 1980: *Theology in Conflict. Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans.* Suppl NT LIII. Leiden.
Munck, Johannes, 1952: Menigheden uden partier, *DTT* 15, p.215-33,
--- 1959: *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind.* London.
--- 1967: *Christ and Israel. An Interpretation of Romans 9-11.* Philadelphia.
Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, 1968: Truth: Paul and Qumran. In *Paul and Qumran.* London, p.179-230. Reissued as *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. J. Murphy O'Connor and James H. Charlesworth, New York 1990.
--- 1970: An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1, *RB* 77, p.201-29.
--- 1971: A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3, *RB* 78,

p.210-32.
--- 1972: The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VII,3-19), *RB* 79, p.200-216.
--- 1972: A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33-XX,34, *RB* 79, p.544-64.
--- 1985: The Damascus Document Revisited, *RB* 92, p.223-46.
--- 1986: "*Pneumatikoi* and Judaizers in 2 Cor 2.14-4.6". *ABR* 34, p.42-58.
--- 1990: John the Baptist and Jesus: History and Hypothesis. *NTS* 36, p.359-74.
--- 1991: *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians.* Cambridge- New York- Port Chester- Melbourne- Sydney.
Murray, Robert, 1992: *The Cosmic Covenant. Biblical Themes of Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation.* Heythrop Monographs 7. London.
Mussner, Franz, 1984: *Tractate on the Jews. The Significance of Judaism for Christian Faith.* Philadelphia, London.
--- 1987: *Die Kraft der Wurzel. Judentum-Jesus-Kirche.* Freiburg, Basel, Wien.

Nahum, Menahem of Chernobyl, 1982: *Upright Practices. The Light of the Eyes.* The Classics of Western Spirituality. New York. Ramsey. Toronto.
Neary, Michael, 1983-84: Creation and Pauline Soteriology. *IrTQ* 50, p.1-34.
Nel, Philip, 1988: Psalm 132 and Covenant Theology. *Text and Context. Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham.* Ed. W. Claassen. JSOTS 48, Sheffield.
Nepper-Christensen, Poul, 1985: Die Taufe im Matthäusevangelium. Im Lichte der Traditionen über Johannes den Täufer. *NTS* 31, p.189-207.
Neusner, Jacob, 1979: Geschichte der rituelle Reinheit im Judentum des 1. Jahrhunderts N.Chr. *Kairos*, 21, p.119-32.
--- 1989: The Absoluteness of Christianity and the Uniqueness of Judaism. Why Salvation is not of the Jews. *Interp* 43, p.18-31.
Newton, Michael, 1985: *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul.* SNTS Monograph Series 53. Cambridge.
Neyrey, Jerome H., 1988: Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology. *CBQ* 50, p.72-100. Repr. in *Paul, in Other Words.*
--- 1990: *Paul, in Other Words. A Cultural Reading of His Letters.* Louisville, Kentucky.
Nickelsburg, George W.E., 1981: *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction.* London.
Nicholson, Ernest W., 1986: *God and His People. Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament.* Oxford.
Nielsen, Eduard, 1955: *Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation.* Copenhagen.
--- 1986: Udvælgelse og universalisme i Det gamle Testamente. In *Judendom och kristendom under de första århundradena.* Nordisk patristikerprojekt 1982-85, vol 1. Stavanger, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø, p.52-67.
Nissen, Johannes, 1982: Den urkristne dåb som kirke-sociologisk faktor. In *Dåben i Ny Testamente.* Red. Sigfred Pedersen. Aarhus, p.202-29.
Noack, Bent, 1958: Qumran and the Book of Jubilees. *SEA* 22-23, p.191-207.
--- 1962: The Day of Pentecost in Jubilees, Qumran, and Acts. *ASTI* 1, p.73-95.
--- 1971: *Spätjudentum und Heilsgeschichte.* Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1968. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz.
--- 1986: Den nye pagt i Det nye Testamente. In *Judendom och kristendom under de första århundradena.* Nordisk patristikerprojekt 1982-85 Vol 1, Stavanger, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø, p.237-58.
--- 1992: *Fra det exegetiske værksted. Artikler og notater.* Red. Sigfred Pedersen. København.
Nodet, Étienne, 1985: Jésus et Jean-Baptiste selon Josephe. *RB* 92, p.321-48.497-524.
North, R., 1980: חרם, *TDOT* IV, p.225-44.
Noth, Martin, 1930: *Das System der zwölfstämme Israels.* Stuttgart.
Nötscher, Friedrich, 1959: Schicksalsglaube in Qumran und Umwelt. *BZ* 3,

p.205-34.
--- 1959-60: Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften. *RdQ* 2, p.163-81; 315-44.

Oepke, Albrecht, 1933: βάπτω, *ThWNT* I, p.527-44.
--- 1964: ἐνδύω, *TDNT* II, 319-21.
Olsson, Birger, 1974: *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel. A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2,11 and 4,1-42.* CB.NT 6. Lund.
Osten Sacken, Peter von der, 1981: Geist im Buchstaben. Vom Glanz des Mose und des Paulus. *EvTh* 4, p.230-35.
--- 1989: *Die Heiligkeit der Tora. Studien zum Gesetz bei Paulus.* München.
Ottoson, M., 1973: אֶרֶץ, *ThWAT* I, col.421-36.
Otzen, Benedikt, 1954: Die neugefundenen hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen. *StTh* 7, p.125-57.
--- 1957: Some Text-problems in 1QS. *StTh* 11, p.89-98.
--- 1975: בדל, *TDOT* II, 1975, p.1-3.
--- 1982: *Israeliterne i Palæstina. Det gamle Israels historie, religion og litteratur.* København.
--- 1984: Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function. In *In the Shelter of Elyon.* Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G.W. Ahlström. Ed. W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer. JSOTS 31. Sheffield.
--- 1989: Det Ny Jerusalem i Johannes' Åbenbaring og i de jødiske apokalypser. In *Det ny Jerusalem. Guds by og de skiftende forventninger.* Red. Anna Marie Aagaard. Frederiksberg, p.49-66.
--- 1990: *Judaism in Antiquity. Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian.* Translation Frederick H. Cryer. BiblSemSer 7. Sheffield.

Patte, Daniel, 1975: *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine.* SBL Diss 22, Missoula.
Paul, André, 1985: Flavius Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews': An Anti-Christian Manifesto. *NTS* 31, p.473-80.
Paulsen, Henning, 1980: Einheit und Freiheit der Söhne Gottes. Gal 3,26-29. *ZNW* 71, p.74-95.
Pedersen, Johs., 1926-1940: *Israel. Its Life and Culture.* I-II and II-IV. London, Copenhagen, repr. 1959.
Pedersen, Olaf, 1983: The Ecclesiastical Calendar and the life of the Church. In *Gregorian Reform of the Calendar.* Ed. G.W. Loyne, M.A. Hoskyn, O. Pedersen. Vatican City.
Pedersen, Sigfred, 1980: *Kærligheden hedder Kristus. En gudstjenestens etik (1. Korinter 13).* Aarhus.
--- 1985: Theologische Überlegungen zur Isagogik des Römerbriefes. *ZNW* 76, p.47-67.
--- 1987: Die Gotteserfahrung bei Jesus. *StTh* 41, p.127-56.
--- 1989: Det gamle Testamente i Ny Testamente. In *Skriftsyn og Metode. Om den nytestamentlige hermeneutik.* Ed. Sigfred Pedersen. Aarhus, p.11-49.
Perlitt, Lothar, 1969: *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament.* WMANT 36. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
Ploeg, J. van der, 1957: The Meals of the Essenes. *JSS* 2, p.163-75.
Preuss, H.D., 1975: בוא, *TDOT* II, p.20-49.
--- 1986: עולם, *ThWAT* V, col.1144-59.
Priest, John F., 1962: Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiah. *JBL* 81, p.55-61.
--- 1963: The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa. *JBL* 82, p.95-100.
Provence, Thomas E., 1982: "Who is Sufficient for These Things"? An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians ii 15-iii 18. *NT* 24, p.54-81.
Pryke, E.J., 1963-64: John the Baptist and the Qumran Community. *RdQ* 4, p.481-96.
--- 1964-66: The Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy communion in the Light of the Ritual Washings and Sacred Meals at Qumran. *RdQ* 5, p.543-552.
--- 1967: Beliefs and Practices of the Qumran Community. *CQR* 168, p.314-25.

Quell, Gottfried, 1964: διαθήκη, A, TDNT II, p.106-24.

Qimron, Elisha, 1978: New Readings in the Temple Scroll. *IEJ* 28, p.161-72.

Rabin, Chaim, 1957: *Qumran Studies.* Oxford.
Rad, Gerhard von, 1975.1985: *Old Testament Theology I-II.* London.
Räisänen, Heikki, 1983: *Paul and the Law.* Tübingen.
--- 1987: Römer 9-11: Analyse eines geistigen Ringens. *ANRW* II 25,4, p.2891-2939.
---- 1988: Paul, God and Israel: Romans 9-11 in Recent Research. In *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism.* FS: Howard Clark Kee. Eds. Jacob Neusner, Ernest S. Frerichs, Peter Borgen, Richard Horsley. Philadelphia, p.178-206.
Reicke, Bo, 1976: Die Verkündigung des Täufers nach Lukas. In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche.* SNTU 1, p.50-61.
--- 1976: Die jüdischen Baptismen und Johannes der Täufer. In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche.* SNTU 1, p.76-88.
Rensberger, David, 1988: *Overcoming the World. Politics and Community in the Gospel of John.* London.
Richard, Earl, 1981: Polemics, Old Testament, and Theology. A Study of II Cor., III,1-IV,6. *RevBibl* 88, p.340-67.
Richardson, Peter, 1969: *Israel in the Apostolic Church,* SNTS Monograph Series 10, Cambridge.
Riemann, P.A., 1976: Covenant, Mosaic, *IDB,* Suppl Vol, p.192-97.
Riggenbach, E, 1908: Der Begriff διαθήκη im Hebräerbrief. In *Theologische Studien. Theodor Zahn zum 10. Oktober 1908 dargebracht.* Leipzig, p.291-316.
Ringgren, Helmer, 1961: *Tro och liv enligt Döda-havsrullarna.* Stockholm. ET: *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Philadelphia 1963.
--- 1966: *Israelite Religion.* London.
--- 1986: חֹדֶשׁ, *TDOT* V, p.287-96.
Rissi, Mathias, 1969: *Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief: Der alte Bund - Der Prediger- Der Tod.* ATANT 56, Zürich, p.22-64.
Rivkin, Ellis, 19883: Locating John the Baptizer in Palestinian Judaism: The Political Dimension. *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers,* p.79-85.
Roberts, Keith A., 1990: *Religion in Sociological Perspective.* Second Edition. Belmont.
Roetzel, Calvin, 1970: Διαθῆκαι in Romans 9,4. *Bib* 51, p.377-90.
Rost, L., 1959: Zur Struktur der Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus. *VT* 9, p.393-98.
Rowland, Christopher, 1982: *The Open Heaven,* London.
--- 1985: *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism.* London.
Rowley, H.H., 1950: *The Biblical Doctrine of Election.* London.
--- 1952: *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Oxford.
--- 1959: The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect. In *New Testament Essays,* ed. A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester, p.218-229.
--- 1963: Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John. In *From Moses to Qumran.* London, p.211-35. (Earlier edition in *HUCA* 15, 1940, p.313-34).
Ruppert, Lothar, 1983: Symbole im Alten Testament. In *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie.* Hrsg. Josef Schreiner. Stuttgart, p.93-105.
Rylaarsdam, J. Coert, 1972: Jewish-Christian Relationship: The Two Covenants and the Dilemmas of Christology. *JES* 9, p.249-70.

Sanders, E.P., 1976: The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism. In *Jews, Greeks and Christians. Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity.* Ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden, p.11-44.
--- 1977: *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion.* London.
--- 1983: *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People.* London.
--- 1992: *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE.* London. Philadelphia.

Sandmel, Samuel, 1978: *Judaism and Christian Beginnings.* New York.
Sänger, Dieter, 1986: Rettung der Heiden und Erwählung Israels. Einige vorläufige Erwägungen zu Römer 11,25-27. *KuD* 32, p.99-119.
Sasson, Jack M, 1966: Circumcision in the Ancient Near East. *JBL* 85, p.473-76.
Schaller, Berndt, 1984: *HΞEI EK ΣIΩN O PYOMENOΣ.* Zur Textgestalt von Jes 59:20f in Röm 11,26f. In *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday.* Ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox. Benben Publications.
Schelbert, Georg, 1988: Jubiläenbuch, *TRE* 17, p.285-89.
Schiffman, Lawrence H., 1980: The Temple Scroll in Literary and Philological Perspective. In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* II. Ed. William Scott Green. Brown Judaic Studies 9. Missoula, p.143-55.
--- 1981: At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism, *in Jewish and Christian Self- Definition,* vol 2, *Aspects of Judaism in the Greaco-Roman Period.* Ed. E.P. Sanders, with A.I. Baumgarten and Alan Mendelson. London, p.115-56.
--- 1983: *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code.* Brown Judaic Studies 33. Chico.
--- 1989: The Temple Scroll and the System of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.239-55.
--- 1989: *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation.* SBL Monographs Series 38. Atlanta. Georgia.
Schmid, Hans Heinrich, 1974: *Altorientalische Welt in der alttestamentlichen Theologie.* Sechs Aufsätze. Zürich.
Schmithals, Walter, 1971: *Gnosticism in Corinth.* Nashville.
Schmitt, Rainer, 1984: *Gottesgerechtigkeit-Heilsgeschichte-Israel in der Theologie des Paulus.* Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Nancy.
Schneider, Johannes, 1952: *Die Taufe im Neuen Testanent.* Stuttgart.
Schnelle, Udo, 1983: *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart. Vorpaulinische und paulinische Tauftheologie.* GTA 24, Göttingen.
Schulz, Siegfried, 1958: Die Decke des Moses. Untersuchungen zu einer vorpaulinischen Überlieferung in II Cor 3,7-18. *ZNW* 49, p.1-30.
Schwager, Raymund, 1978, Wassertaufe, Ein Gebet um die Geisttaufe? *ZKTh* 100, p.36-61.
Schwarz, Eberhard, 1982: *Identität durch Abgrenzung. Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Jubiläenbuches.* Europäische Hochschulschriften vol 162. Frankfurt am Main, Bern.
Scobie, Charles H.H., 1964: *John the Baptist.* London.
Scolnic, Benjamin Edidin, 1991: Moses and the Horns of Power. *Jud* 40, p.571-79.
Seebass, Horst, 1973: בחר, *ThWAT* I, col.592-608.
--- 1982: Erwählung I, *TRE* 10, p.182-89.
Segal, Alan F., 1986: *Rebecca's Children. Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, London.
--- 1990: *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee.* New Haven, London.
Seidensticker, Philipp, 1958-59: Die Gemeinschaftsform der religiösen Gruppen des Spätjudentums und der Urkirche. *SBFLA* 9, p.94-198.
Sekine, Masao, 1963: Vom Verstehen der Heilsgeschichte. Das Grundproblem der alttestamentlichen Theologie. *ZAW* 75, p.145-54.
Siegert, Folker, 1985: *Argumentation bei Paulus gezeigt an Röm 9-11.* WMNT 34. Tübingen.
Sigal, Phillip, 1983: Aspects of Dual Covenant Theology: Salvation. *HBT* 5, p.1-48.
Silberman, Lou H., 1972/74: Chosen People. *EJ* 5, col.498-502.
Sjöberg, Erik, 1938: *Gott und die Sünder im Palästinischen Judentum nach dem*

Zeugniss der Tannaiten und der apocryphisch- pseudepigraphischen Literatur. BWANT 79, Stuttgart.
--- 1955: Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen. *StTh* 9, p.131-36.
Smit, Joop, 1989: The Letter of Paul to the Galatians: A Deliberative Speech. *NTS* 35, p.1-26.
Soggin, J. A., 1984: שׁוּב, *THAT* II, col.884-91.
Stähli, H.-P., 1984: עבר, *THAT* II, col.200-204.
Stanley, David Michael, 1957: The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism: An Essay in Biblical Theology. *TS* 18, p.169-215.
Steensgaard, Peter, 1982: Dåbsforestillinger i den tidlige jødedom. In *Dåben i Ny Testamente.* Red. Sigfred Pedersen. Aarhus, p.14-28.
Stegemann, Ekkehard, 1977: Alt und Neu bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (Kol-Eph). *EvT* 37, p.508-36.
--- 1986: Der Neue Bund im Alten. Zum Schriftverständnis des Paulus in II Kor 3. *ThZ* 42, p.97-114.
Stegemann, Hartmut, 1971: *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde.* Diss. Bonn.
--- 1983: "Das Land" in der Tempelrolle und in anderen Texten aus den Qumranfunden. In *Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit. Jerusalem-Symposium 1981 der Hebräischen Universität und der Georg-August-Universität.* Hrsg. Georg Strecker. GTA 25. Göttingen, p.154-71.
--- 1989: The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.123-48.
Stendahl, Krister (ed), 1958: *The Scrolls and the New Testament.* London.
--- 1970: The New Testament Background for the Doctrine of the Sacraments. *Oecumenica. Jahrbuch für ökumenische Forschung.* Strassbourg.
--- 1976: *Paul among Jes and Gentiles and Other Essays.* Philadelphia.
Stromberg, A. von, 1913: *Studien zur Theorie und Praxis der Taufe in der christlichen Kirche der ertsen zwei Jahrhunderte.* Berlin.
Stuhlmacher, Peter, 1967: Erägungen zur ontologischen Character der καινὴ κτίσις bei Paulus. *EvTh* 27, p.1-34.
--- 1971: Zur Interpretation von Römer 11,25-32. In *Probleme biblischer Theologie.* Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag. Hrsg. Hans Walter Wolff. München, p.555-70.
Stummer, F., 1954: Beschneidung. *RAC* 2, col.159-69.
Sumney, Jerry L., 1990: *Identifying Paul's Opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians.* JSNTS 40. Sheffield.
Sutcliffe, Edmund F., 1960: Baptism and Baptismal Rites at Qumran. *HeyJ* 1, p.179-88.
Swetnam, James, 1966: *Diatheke* in the Spetuagint Account of sinai: A Suggestion. *Bib* 47, p.439-44.

Talbert, Charles, 1987: Paul on the Covenant. *REx* 84, p.299-313.
Talmon, Shemaryaha, 1989: *The World of Qumran from Within. Collected Studies.* Jerusalem, Leiden.
Taylor, Nicholas, 1992: *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem. A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity.* JSNTS 66. Sheffield.
Testuz, Michel, 1960: *Les Idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés.* Geneve, Paris.
Theissen, Gerd, 1978: *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.* Philadelphia.
--- 1979: *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums.* WUNT 19, Tübingen.
--- 1979: Die Starken und Schwachen in Korinth. Soziologische Analyse eines theologischen Streites. In *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums,* p.272-89.
--- 1983: *Psychologische Aspekte paulinischer Theologie.* FRLANT 131, Göttingen.
Theobald, Michael, 1987: Kirche und Israel nach Röm 9-11. *Kairos* 29, p.1-22.
Thiering, B.E., 1980: Inner and Outer Cleansing at Qumran as a Background to New Testament Baptism. *NTS* 26, p.266-77.
--- 1981: Qumran Initiation and New Testament Baptism. *NTS* 27, p.615-31.

--- 1989: The Date and Composition of the Temple Scroll. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.99-120.
Thyen, Hartwig, 1964: *ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ.* In *Zeit und Geschichte.* Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Hrsg Erich Dinkler. Tübingen p.97-125.
--- 1970: *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen.* FRLANT 96. Göttingen.
Trilling, Wolfgang, 1959: Die Täufertraditionen bei Matthäus. *BZ* 3, p.271-289.

Ulonska, H., 1966: Die Doxa des Moses, *EvTh* 26, p.378-88.
Unnik, W.C. van, 1960: La conception paulinienne de la nouvelle alliance. In *Littérature et théologie pauliniennes.* RechBib 5. Louvain, p.109-126.
--- 1961: *Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη* - a Problem in the early history of the Canon. In *Studia Patristica* IV. Ed. F.L. Cross. TU 79, Berlin, p.212-27.
--- 1963: "With Unveiled Face", an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians iii 12-18, *NT* 6, p.153-69. (repr. *Sparsa Collecta,* Part I, NTSuppl 29, Leiden 1973, p.194-210.)

Valeton. J.J.P., 1892: Bedeutung und Stellung des Wortes ברית im Priestercodex. *ZAW* 12, p.1-22.
--- 1892: Das Wort ברית in den jehovistischen und deuteronomistischen Stücken des Hexateuchs, sowie in den verwandten historischen Büchern. *ZAW* 12, p.224-60.
--- 1893: Das Wort ברית bei den Propheten und in den Ketubim. -Resultat. *ZAW* 13, p.245-79.
VanderKam, James C., 1977: *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees.* HSS 14. Missoula.
--- 1980: The Righteousness of Noah. In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms.* Ed. John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg. SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico, p.13-32.
--- 1989: The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees. In *Temple Scroll Studies. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll. Manchester, December 1987.* Ed. George J. Brooke. JSPS 7. Sheffield, p.211-36.
Vermes, Geza, 1960: Essenes- Therapeutai- Qumran. *DUJ* 52, p.97-115.
--- 1977.1982: *The Dead Sea Scroll. Qumran in Perspective.* London.
--- 1983: *Jesus and the World of Judaism.* London.
Vermes, G. and M.D. Goodmann (eds.), 1989: *The Essenes. According to Classical Sources.* Oxford Centre Textbooks 1. Sheffield.
Vielhauer, Philipp, 1965: Tracht und Speise Johannes des Täufers. In *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* I. TB 31. München, p.47-54.
--- 1979: Paulus und das Alte Testament. In *Oikodome, Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* Bd 2. Hrsg. Günther Klein, München, p.196-228.
Vriezen, Th.C., 1953: *Die Erwählung Israels nach dem A.T.* ATANT 159, Zürich.

Wagner, Guy, 1985: Alliance de la lettre, alliance de l'Esprit. Essai d'analyse de 2 Corinthiens 2,14 3,18. *ETR* 60, p.55-65.
Wagner, Siegfried (ed.), 1968: *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissen schaft.* FS: Hans Bardtke. Berlin.
Watson, Francis, 1986: *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach.* SNTS Monograph Series 56, Cambridge.
Webb, Robert L., 1991: *John the Baptizer and Prophet. A Socio-Historical Study.* JSNTS 62. Sheffield.
Wedderburn, A.J.M., 1987: *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background.* WUNT Tübingen.
Weinfeld, Moshe, 1970: The Covenant Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East. *JAOS* 90, p.185-203.
--- 1971: Covenant, *EJ* 5, col.1012-1022.

--- 1973: Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and its Influence on the West. *JAOS* 93,p.190-99.
--- 1973: ברית *ThWAT* I, col.781-808.
--- 1976: Covenant, Davidic. *IDB* Suppl Vol, p.188-92.
--- 1986: *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect.* NTOA 2, Göttingen.
Wellhausen, J, 1883: *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* Berlin.
Wernberg-Møller, P., 1955: Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline. *StTh* 9, p.40-66.
--- 1966-68: The Nature of YAHAD According to the Manual of Discipline and Related Documents. *ALUOS* 6, p.56-81.
Westermann, Claus, 1976: Genesis 17 und die Bedeutung von berit. *ThLZ* 101, col.161-170.
Wiesenberg, Ernest, 1961: The Jubilee of Jubilees. *RdQ* 3, p.3-40.
Wildberger, Hans, 1960: *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk.* ATANT 37, Zürich, Stuttgart.
--- 1971: בחר, *THAT* I, col.275-300.
Wilson, Robert R., 1980: *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel.* Philadelphia.
Windisch, Hans, 1920: *Die Apostolischen Väter III, Der Barnabasbrief.* HNT Ergänzungs-band. Tübingen.
Wink, Walter, 1968: *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition.* Cambridge.
Wise, Michael O., 1989: The Covenant of the Temple Scroll XXIX,3-10. *RdQ* 14, p.49-60.
--- 1990: The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll. *JNES* 49, p.155-72.
--- 1990: *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran 11.* Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49. Chicago.
Witherington, B., 1992: John the Baptist. *DJG*, p.383-91.
Woude, Adam S. van der, 1989: Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988). *ThR* 54, p.221-61.
--- 1990: Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988). *ThR* 55, p.245-307.
--- 1992: Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988). *ThR* 57, p.1-57. 225-253.
Wright, G. Ernest, 1950: *The Old Testament Against its Environment.* Studies in Biblical Theology 2, London.
Wright, N.T., 1987: Reflected Glory: 2 Corinthians 3:18. In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament. Studies in Christology.* In memory of George Bradford Caird. Oxford, p.139-150.
--- 1991: *The Climax of the Covenant. Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Edinburgh.
Wyatt, Nicholas, 1990: Symbols of exile. *SEA* 55, p.39-58.

Yadin, Yigael, 1985: *The Temple Scroll. The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect.* London.
Young, Frances and David F. Ford, 1987: *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians.* London.
Yu, Young Ki, 1989, *The New Covenant: The Promise and Its Fulfilment. An Inquiry into the Influence of the New covenant Concept of Jer 31,31-34 on Later Religious Thought with Particular Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.* Ph.D Thesis. Durham.

Zeitlin, Solomon, 1939-40: The Book of Jubilees, its Character and its Significance. *JQR* 30, p.1-31,
--- 1957-58: The Book of "Jubilees" and the Pentateuch. *JQR* 48, p.218-35.
Zimmerli, Walther, 1983: Das "Land" bei den vorexilischen und früh-exilischen Propheten. In *Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit. Jerusalem-Symposium 1981 der Hebräischen Universität und der Georg-August-Universität.* Hrsg. Georg Strecker. GTA 25. Göttingen, p.33-45.